

CALIFORNIA HIGH-SPPEED RAIL AUTHORITY
MONTHLY MEETING

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

PALMDALE CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
38300 SIERRA HIGHWAY, SUITE B
PALMDALE, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

9:00 A.M.

Reported by:

Martha L. Nelson

APPEARANCES

BOARD MEMBERS

Dan Richard, Chairman
Tom Richards, Vice Chair
Michael Rossi
Thea Selby
Lynn Schenk
Jeff Morales
Rick Frank
Katherine Perez-Estolano
Patrick Henning

STAFF

Janice Neibel

ALSO PRESENT

James Ledford, Mayor, City of Palmdale
Scott Wilk, Assemblyman
Fred Thompson
Steve Hofbauer
Marsha McLean, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Santa Clarita
Robert Gonzales, Mayor Pro Tem, City of San Fernando
Jesse Avila, Council Member, City of San Fernando
Joel Fajardo, City of San Fernando
Tim Ben Boydston, City of Santa Clarita

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT

Kris Murray, Mayor Pro Tem, City of Anaheim

Anne Ambrose, City of Palmdale

Michael Behan, City of Palmdale

Pamela Walter

Kathleen Trinity

Bruce Ganson

John Farrar

Mickey Azola

Sandra Madsen

Michael Hughes

Tippi Hedren

Jacqueline Ayer

Donald Sommer

Lynn David, Sulphur Springs School District

William Barritt, Santa Clarita Chamber of Commerce

Stephen Velenziano

Michael Hogan, Sr., High-Speed Rail Community Committee

Michael Hogan, Jr., High-Speed Rail Community Committee

David De Pinto

Gail Wilkie

Jan Walky

Toby Tackitt

Cindy Bloom

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT

Thomas Despres

Pamela Miller

Chris Lupton

Douglas Leonard

Kathy Delson

Ginger Tanner

Gerardo Barrientos

Tina Eike, Shadow Hills Horse Owners Association

Marsha Drucker

Teresa Ortiz

Carolyn Moore

Toni Ingallina

Roberta Cole

Shelli Andranigian

Maria Mejia

Martha Hankins

Donna Lauber

Fred Arnold

Rich Poston

Sandra Cattell

Lee Anne Eager

Wendy Williams, Antelope Valley Transit Authority

Alan Scott

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

ALSO PRESENT

Paul Dyson, Rail Passengers Association of California
Julie McKeehan, Antelope Valley AQMD
Ron Miller, Building Trades Council
Laurie Hunter, High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority
Frank Oliveira, Citizens for California HSR Accountability
Nancy Woodruff, Foothill Trails Neighborhood Council
Susan Mansis, Shadow Hills Property Owners Association
Greg Bashan, Teamsters Local 986
Linda Campanella Jauron
Michael Liikala, Solutions International
Mitch Klein, IBEW
Carol Locus
Tamara Loperfito
Bruce Pique
Gerri Summe
Brian Saeki
Andrew Mack, XpressWest
Michelle Boehm
Tom Fellenz
Don Sepulveda, L.A. Metropolitan Transportation Authority

<u>INDEX</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Roll Call	1
Public Comment	3
1. Consider Approval of Board Meeting Minutes from August 12 Board Meeting	122
2. Presentation on the City of Palmdale's Planning Efforts	124
3. Status Update on the XpressWest Project	131
4. Status Update on the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Regional Program	169
5. Report on Recent Scoping Meetings for the Palmdale to Burbank and Burbank to Los Angeles Project Sections	188
6. Status Updates on the Los Angeles to Anaheim and Los Angeles to San Diego Project Sections	194

	<u>INDEX CONTINUED</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
7.	Consider Releasing a Request for Qualifications for Regional Consultant Services for the Burbank to Los Angeles/Anaheim Corridor	145
8.	Consider Making Findings Pursuant to Government Code Section 51292 (Agricultural Preserve/ Williamson Act) for High-Speed Rail-Related Improvement Locations in Fresno County (CP JC and part of CP 2-3)	152
9.	Consider Providing Authorization to Negotiate and Bind Excess Liability Umbrella Insurance Policies	---
10.	Consider Awarding Contracts for Right of Way Support Services	155
11.	Closed Session Pertaining to Litigation	203

PROCEDINGS

9:04 a.m.

PROCEEDINGS BEGIN AT 9:04 A.M.

PALMDALE, CALIFORNIA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2014

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning, everyone, and
6 welcome to Palmdale. Good morning. This meeting of the
7 California High-Speed Rail Authority will come to order.
8 Before I ask our Board Secretary to take the roll, let me
9 just point out that we are extremely pleased to be here in
10 Palmdale this morning. We appreciate the graciousness of
11 the city in allowing us to use these facilities.

12 I do understand, however, that this room is
13 smaller than some of the venues that we use. I understand
14 that there is an overflow room. And that -- thanks to the
15 facilities of the city that -- that this -- these
16 proceedings are being streamed. And we will make
17 accommodations to make sure that everyone who wishes to
18 speak will be able to speak, including people who may be in
19 the overflow room. And we'll accommodate their needing to
20 transit from that room to here.

21 So even though it's compact, and even though it
22 is, perhaps, a little bit challenging logistically given the
23 number of people who -- who want to be here today, we will
24 make this work.

25 So let me ask our secretary to please call the

1 roll.

2 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?

3 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Here.

4 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?

5 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Here.

6 COMMISSIONER CHOPER: Vice Chair Hartnett? Mr.
7 Rossi?

8 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Here.

9 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

10 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Here.

11 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?

12 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Here.

13 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?

14 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Here.

15 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?

16 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Here.

17 MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I would like to ask the Mayor
19 of Palmdale, the Honorable James Ledford, to come forward
20 and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. And then, Mayor,
21 we'd appreciate any welcoming remarks you have.

22 MAYOR LEDFORD: Thank you. Would you all please
23 rise? Remove your hats, please. Hand over your heart.

24 (Whereupon the Pledge of Allegiance is made.)

25 MAYOR LEDFORD: Let's remain standing. Let's have

1 a moment of silence in support of our military, please.

2 Thank you very much.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Mayor, I know you
4 have a presentation later. But I thought if you would just
5 get us started this morning, that would be great.

6 MAYOR LEDFORD: I appreciate that. And Honorable
7 Chair, Authority Board, Staff, welcome, good morning. This
8 is the high desert, and it's going to get warm today. But
9 as long as we stay indoors we're going to be fine.

10 I want to thank everybody for coming to our City
11 of Palmdale. We're excited about this project. And we
12 appreciate your taking the extra step to provide input and
13 opportunity for people to speak on this very, very important
14 project for the State of California. There's lots of
15 challenges, but this is the time for input. This is the
16 time to receive all of the pros and cons. It gives
17 everybody an opportunity to say their peace, so I think that
18 is awesome.

19 The future, I believe, for high-speed rail centers
20 here in the Antelope Valley. We're excited about being a
21 possible center of an interstate route, meaning this
22 XpressWest possibly connecting to the California High-Speed
23 Rail here in our City of Palmdale. We see that as an
24 exciting future for us. So I'm just going to help set the
25 stage and say good morning. We're excited. Thank you for

1 being here.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you
3 very much.

4 We do have a number of people who want to speak
5 this morning. I'm sure that 90 percent of the people who
6 are here want to talk about item nine, having to do with our
7 insurance policies. But we are -- we're be pulling that
8 from the agenda for further consideration by the staff, so
9 that -- that won't be heard.

10 It is our custom in taking public comment to begin
11 with the elected representatives of the people. We ask that
12 they speak first, and then we take public comment in the
13 order it was received.

14 So first we have -- we're very pleased to have a
15 member of the State Assembly representing this community,
16 Assembly Member Wilk. We'd ask you to come forward at this
17 time, sir. Thank you for being here.

18 ASSEMBLYMAN WILK: Thank you, Chairman Richard.
19 In fact, I was here to speak on item nine. But since you've
20 pulled it I'll go -- I'll go ahead and address item five.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That would be fine.

22 ASSEMBLYMAN WILK: Great. Thank you very much,
23 Chairman Richard, and Board of Directors. As noted, I'm
24 Assemblyman Scott Wilk. I represent the 38th Assembly
25 District which comprises, for the purposes of the discussion

1 today, the communities from Aqua Dulce south to the I-5/14
2 split.

3 No doubt you heard in the prior scoping meetings
4 regarding the proposed Palmdale to Burbank line that the
5 communities in my district are strongly opposed to the SR-14
6 route, even if they are supportive of the overall project.
7 The S14 [sic] service alignment would wreak havoc on the
8 quality of life for those existing communities as it would
9 eliminate homes, devastate neighborhoods, local schools,
10 churches, as well as negatively impact planned communities
11 for that area that are currently being entitled.

12 Additionally, it's become increasingly clear that
13 environmental damage and disruption of key business sectors
14 would occur, particularly during the construction phase.
15 Negative impacts such as noise, vibration, air quality, and
16 traffic congestion will affect both commerce and residents'
17 quality of life.

18 Choosing this route would quash the film and
19 television industry which is vital to the Santa Clarita
20 Valley, and during construction phase, I believe, could
21 potentially pose a national security threat. The SR-14 is
22 the main artery between the Ventura County Naval Base, L.A.
23 Air Force Base, and then up here with Plant 42 (phonetic),
24 the prime manufacturers, as well as Edwards Air Force Base
25 and naval -- and China Lake Naval Weapons Center.

1 Furthermore, as a resident who survived the Sylmar
2 quake up here living in Lancaster in 1971, or as a resident
3 of Santa Clarita during the 1994 Northridge quake, it makes
4 no sense to me to do this kind of investment of
5 infrastructure, having the rail line parallel the 14
6 Freeway. That redundancy of infrastructure, to me, I think
7 is not wise.

8 Fortunately for -- for the High-Speed Rail
9 Project, we now have a positive alternative that offers a
10 more direct line which will reduce the overall trip time
11 between Palmdale and Burbank, avoids all negative impacts to
12 the neighborhoods and businesses, and the environmental
13 concerns discussed earlier. It may even reduce the cost and
14 timeframe of the project, so that would be a triple win for
15 the Authority in my opinion.

16 Accordingly, I would suggest that you consider
17 dropping the SR-14 service alignment alternative as soon as
18 your -- your environmental review process would allow, and
19 then hasten the -- the selection of the preferred alignment
20 which would be through the San Gabriel Mountains. To do so
21 will, I believe, crippling community opposition and allow
22 the possibility of the High-Speed Rail Project and process
23 to continue. And I really appreciate your time and
24 consideration. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Assembly Member, thank you very

1 much. We appreciate that.

2 ASSEMBLYMAN WILK: Yeah.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Next, let me see if I can group
4 these by community. From the City of Palmdale, Fred
5 Thompson, City Council Member. Good morning, sir.

6 MR. THOMPSON: Good morning, Board Chairman and
7 High-Speed Rail Board Members. We appreciate you being
8 here. We know that you rescheduled and made some
9 arrangements to come here, and I think that is wonderful
10 that you're here to hear the --

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Could you speak a little more
12 into the mike, sir?

13 MR. THOMPSON: -- hear the input from our
14 community.

15 I would also like to add that we would also urge
16 the High-Speed Rail Board to consider building Palmdale to
17 Burbank phase, followed by the Palmdale to Bakersfield
18 phase, providing access to the San Fernando Valley, and then
19 closing the gap between Palmdale and Bakersfield will
20 provide tremendous economic development, housing, jobs and
21 growth opportunities for the region.

22 Also, this morning I -- when I was going through
23 my notes I also considered the fact that we have a very fine
24 community college here in the form of Antelope Valley
25 College, but we have a lot of students who wish to transfer.

1 And as you know, we have four-year colleges that are some
2 distance away, and high-speed rail would provide immediate
3 access to Bakersfield College, as well as Northridge. And I
4 think commuter time would be cut tremendously.

5 So I see only advantages to the high-speed rail,
6 so thank you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

8 Steve Hofbauer, City of Palmdale.

9 MR. HOFBAUER: Thank you, sir. Good to see you
10 again.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good to see you.

12 MR. HOFBAUER: And we really appreciate you folks
13 coming down here. Believe me, some of the boards I serve
14 on, I understand the road trip concept, so I get it.

15 You know, we -- out here I'm one of the -- I'm one
16 of those folks that takes the commuter train down below.
17 It's an hour-and-a-half to get from Palmdale to Union
18 Station down there. That's not counting what -- the time it
19 takes to get over to the station and to get -- ultimately
20 get to where you need to be. To be able to cut that time
21 down is really important.

22 The whole purpose of any transportation systems is
23 to connect areas of commerce to areas where people are
24 living and to financial centers. That was the original
25 intent of the -- of the current rail system. And we have

1 some gaps that need to be filled in, not just the gap from
2 here up over the Tehachapis, but the -- but the virtual gap
3 that we have between here and Union Station. That's really
4 a hindrance. And we're starting to see a decline in the use
5 of that because people are taking either the bus or they're
6 taking cars down there.

7 The -- the tunnel option, I think, really is -- is
8 a unique opportunity to alleviate some of the opposition
9 that we're seeing with our neighbors to the south. And
10 the -- the current concept that I believe Chairman Richard
11 had come up with of the blended approach, I think that, you
12 know, that really makes a lot of sense. People have
13 criticized that. But let's stop and take -- let's go back
14 50 years to when the -- when the interstate system was
15 built. When it was built it just didn't show up one day. I
16 mean, it started some place and there were other roads that
17 connected to it. The blended system provides that.

18 So I think you guys are on the right track. I
19 think you've got a good plan here to move forward with this.
20 And Palmdale is ready and set up and to be the center for
21 all interconnectivity here. Thank you very much for your
22 time.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much. Let me
24 just correct the record. I'd love to take credit for the
25 blended approach, but that had many, many other authors,

1 some in the legislature, some in the congress, some in our
2 staff. So I won't claim parentage for that.

3 Marsha McLean, the Mayor Pro Tem for the City of
4 Santa Clarita. Welcome, Mayor.

5 MAYOR PRO TEM MCLEAN: Good morning. I am Marsha
6 McLean and I am the Mayor Pro Tem for the City of Santa
7 Clarita. And I am pleased to be here this morning to urge
8 the Board to include the Palmdale to Burbank direct
9 alignment in the environmental impact report statement for
10 the rail segment between Palmdale and Burbank.

11 The Santa Clarita City Council strongly believes
12 the direct alignment is the superior alternative worthy of
13 further evaluation, including the direct alignment in the
14 environmental review will provide an excellent side-by-side
15 comparison of costs, travel times and specific environmental
16 impacts that will lead to well-informed decisions by your
17 Board in the future.

18 I would also like to present you a unified
19 statement of support signed by members of the Santa Clarita
20 Valley Transportation Coalition requesting that the Palmdale
21 to Burbank direct alignment be included in the EIS/EIR. The
22 Santa Clarita Valley Transportation Coalition is comprised
23 of business, education and government representatives who
24 have come together to advocate with a unified voice for the
25 transportation projects of importance to the Santa Clarita

1 Valley, a community of approximately 270,000 residents.
2 Over the past few years the board has strived to listen to
3 and work with communities.

4 Well, our community has come together to support
5 the route that will best protect our residents, our homes,
6 our churches, our schools, and our businesses. We urge you
7 to include the direct alignment from the Burbank Airport to
8 Palmdale in the EIS/EIR. Thank you very much.

9 And the blended approach actually was discussed at
10 SCAG (phonetic). I'm a member of SCAG. It's extremely
11 important to be able to have connectivity to reach your --
12 your railroad. And right now there's pretty much not one in
13 Santa Clarita. However, the blended approach is a really
14 good idea.

15 We would have taken the train out here, except we
16 would have had to be here either at eight o'clock or 10:20
17 because of the lack of -- of Metrolink trains out here. So
18 anything you can do to provide connectivity is -- is very
19 welcome. Thank you so much.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mayor.

21 Also from the City of Santa Clarita, Council
22 Member Tim Ben Boydston. Is that right? I hope I didn't
23 mispronounce that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's not -- he's not here.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. We'll set that

1 aside.

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: He's on the 10:20 train.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: No, we -- we have a plan to
4 shorten his commute time.

5 So next is -- I'm happy to welcome Kris Murray,
6 the Mayor Pro Tem for Anaheim. Do we see her here?

7 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She's en route.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: She's en route also? Same
9 train. Yeah, that's -- that's all right. Mr. Frank and I
10 have some things to say about the Oakland As and the Anaheim
11 Angels when she gets here.

12 Robert Gonzales from -- the Mayor Pro Tem of the
13 City of San Fernando. Good morning, Mayor.

14 MAYOR PRO TEM GONZALES: Good morning. Good
15 morning, everybody. Can you guys here me pretty good out
16 there?

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

18 MAYOR PRO TEM GONZALES: Okay. Good morning. I
19 just want to come out here and speak today to really let
20 everybody know that that current SR-14 line would absolutely
21 destroy the City of San Fernando. It will go right through
22 our main corridor. It can potentially take out our bike
23 paths when we're trying to create a healthy city, we're
24 trying to create walk-ability. And we are -- it would also
25 have the potential of taking out our Cesar Chavez monument

1 which at one point was the largest monument dedicated to
2 Cesar Chavez in the nation. The City of San Fernando was
3 the first one to make Cesar Chavez Day a holiday for
4 employees. And that would absolutely destroy our -- our
5 town.

6 It will create sound barrier walls that will
7 completely divide the north and south of the City of San
8 Fernando. And there is tons of historical reference that
9 goes on between the north and south that I'm sure another
10 City Council Member will come up and speak about to let you
11 guys know about that.

12 And also concerns about safety. Our police
13 station is literally next to the line, the current line. So
14 that will create a huge safety issue for us because we would
15 have to completely revamp the way our police force enters
16 and exits our police station to be able to provide service
17 to our -- our residents. And also, our junior high is
18 directly located next to the rail line, as well. And
19 myself, I would not like our junior high students to have to
20 walk under -- under an under path into a tunnel to get to
21 and from school. I completely think that is dangerous and I
22 am opposed to that.

23 I feel very strongly, as well as the community and
24 the rest of the city council, that we really need to take
25 into consideration the alternate route which will be from

1 Palmdale, direct line, to Burbank. It's a shorter, quicker
2 line. And I feel that that is the best line possible,
3 especially for the City of San Fernando, but not only the
4 City of San Fernando but all the outlying cities around the
5 City of San Fernando because it's -- it's a complete
6 regional issue that's going to happen here for people coming
7 in and out of San Fernando. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much, Mayor.

9 Also from the City of San Fernando, Council Member
10 Jesse Avila.

11 MR. AVILA: Good morning. And thank you for this
12 opportunity to speak.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

14 MR. AVILA: We've attended other meetings where we
15 did not. And all of our constituents are not -- not used to
16 that.

17 It has been brought out -- we concur with Santa
18 Clarita. In 1911 San Fernando became an independent city.
19 Since then the railroad track have been a divider, a culture
20 divide, an economic divide, a racial divide. We've worked
21 very hard to work together so that we could work as a city.
22 If it comes through there, the rail above, we're going to
23 have a lot of problems.

24 We concur that the alternative route is better in
25 so many ways. Our police station, our educational systems,

1 and most of our small businesses are within half a block of
2 the tracks. The impact goes beyond economics, though. The
3 cultural component, the socio component, and also our
4 seniors, what I hear about what happened in the '30s, '40s
5 and '50s, though they have long gone and many changes have
6 occurred, it's still in their minds. It goes beyond just
7 simply something going through. They see it as completely
8 changing, going backwards to a north and south sections. We
9 are two cities that will be divided.

10 The safety of our -- of our schools is so close to
11 the tracks that we have an officer stationed there because
12 of the temptation, for whatever it is, of our youth to see
13 that train as an option. We have had suicides. It's within
14 ten feet. It's a constant issue for us, so it goes beyond.

15 We understand the need. We support the need but
16 we support the alternative route, and thank you again for
17 allowing us this opportunity to say so. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Council Member.

19 Staying with the City of San Fernando, Joel --

20 MR. FAJARDO: Farjardo?

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- Farjardo. Yes. I'm sorry.
22 I'm -- it's either my eyes or your handwriting, sir. I'm
23 sorry.

24 MR. FAJARDO: My handwriting -- my handwriting is
25 horrible. Thank you for having me here today, esteemed

1 Board. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you. As a
2 matter of fact, after I leave Palmdale today I'll be headed
3 to Burbank, so I definitely see the need for the high-speed
4 rail. And as my colleagues demonstrated, there is
5 considerable support within the City of San Fernando for
6 high-speed rail, but in a way that doesn't destroy our city.

7 One of the original plans has a concept for having
8 an above-ground train which would lead to various problems
9 for the city. Amongst them would be destroying part of our
10 downtown and much of the economic progress that we've made,
11 destroying some landmarks in the city such as the Cesar
12 Chavez Park. And we urge the Board today that for any stuff
13 that you do take, for any proposals that you do accept that
14 you either have the -- you either use the alternative route
15 or, in my opinion, an underground tunnel to avoid some of
16 these problems. And thank you so much for your time.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Council Member.

18 I understand that Council Member Tim Ben Boydston
19 from the City of Santa Clarita has arrived. Good morning,
20 sir.

21 MR. BOYDSTON: Thank you. I didn't -- I didn't
22 believe it was possible to get lost in the desert, but there
23 you have it. I apologize for being a couple minutes late.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Morales pointed out -- Mr.
25 Morales pointed out that some people got lost for 40 years

1 in the desert.

2 MR. BOYDSTON: Right. Good morning, Chairman
3 Richard and Members of the Board. I'm Santa Clarita City
4 Council Member Tim Ben Boydston. I want to begin by
5 thanking you for holding today's meeting in Southern
6 California.

7 I'm here today to reiterate Santa Clarita City
8 Council's support for inclusion of the Palmdale to Burbank
9 direct alignment in the EIR impact -- environmental impact
10 report. This proposed alignment presents an outstanding new
11 alternative, in addition to the alignments which you
12 approved for inclusion in the EIS/EIR last June. Even with
13 the limited review that this proposal has received so far it
14 appears that there could be a significant time saving for
15 the train route between Palmdale and Burbank at a comparable
16 cost to the current alignment proposals through the Santa
17 Clarita Valley and neighboring communities of Aqua Dulce and
18 Acton.

19 While we recognize a number of concerns still
20 remain in communities affected by the direct alignment
21 proposal, as is the case with the proposed alignments
22 through Santa Clarita, we are confident that the
23 environmental process will be thorough in fairly evaluating
24 all of the proposed alignments. A comprehensive
25 environmental review will enable members of the public to

1 fully understand the impacts of each of the alternatives
2 being evaluated.

3 And on behalf of the residents of the City of
4 Santa Clarita I urge you to include the Palmdale to Burbank
5 direct alignment in the EIS/EIR. And again, thank you for
6 hosting today's meeting in our region, for your
7 consideration of our comments. And once again, my
8 apologies, and have a great day.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. I understand that
10 Mayor Kris Murray from Anaheim has arrived. Mayor Pro Tem,
11 excuse me.

12 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: Hello, Mr. Chairman.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Hello, Mayor.

14 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: I should -- I should say
15 Mayor Pro Tem because the elected mayor might not appreciate
16 that I got that distinguished honor this morning, but thank
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I understand.

19 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: And I appreciate the
20 opportunity to address the -- the panel and the Board this
21 morning.

22 This project is so important. I know you know
23 that in the City of Anaheim we're very dedicated to the
24 project and the completion of the project across the state.
25 And we've had the great privilege of being able to work with

1 extraordinary leaders, including all of you, but certainly
2 Mayor Ledford who has been a stellar advocate of the project
3 since its inception. And we have been very collaborative
4 between our cities.

5 Palmdale will be the gateway for this project to
6 Southern California. It's an extraordinary place to launch
7 it. If it had already been in place I would have been on
8 time, not trying to navigate our highways. This is about
9 providing people options in our region and the connectivity
10 across our state. And that connectivity is going to allow
11 for extraordinary leaps for economic development, for jobs,
12 and for quality of life and the -- and the options of
13 additional modes of travel which are essential as our state
14 and our population grows.

15 So with that I just -- I'm here to speak in
16 support of this wonderful project, to thank Mayor Ledford
17 and his team for their leadership and for their
18 collaboration with our city. And I know they have great
19 plans in place here locally for their city. And as we move
20 forward it's just an incredible honor to work with such
21 great people.

22 So thank you again for the time to speak today.
23 And if there's anything the City of Anaheim can do in
24 partnership with Palmdale and other cities across the state,
25 we stand ready to serve. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Your Regional
2 Transit Center is getting ready to open; right?

3 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: Yes. It will be -- it will
4 be -- it will be open by the first week of December. Mayor
5 Ledford and his team actually just came for a tour, and we
6 were able to spend some quality time with them.

7 And again, I want to reiterate that we extend an
8 invitation to you and to the Members of the Board to join us
9 for our opening which is tentatively scheduled right now for
10 December 6th.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, thank you, and
12 congratulations on that.

13 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And a resident of the East Bay
15 in Northern California, congratulations on your baseball
16 team.

17 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: Thank you. We just cinched
18 a playoff spot.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: The bitterness --

20 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: We're very happy about
21 that.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Some of us are bitter about
23 that.

24 MAYOR PRO TEM MURRAY: Well, as our friends in
25 L.A., that's their team, too, so thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Very good. I'm sorry, again,
2 this is my problem. Is it Ann Ambrose from City of
3 Palmdale?

4 MS. AMBROSE: Uh-huh.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Right there. I'm so
6 sorry.

7 MS. AMBROSE: Good morning, Chair, Members of the
8 Board. My name is Ann Ambrose. I'm the Director of
9 Administrative Services. I'm here on behalf of our City
10 Manager Dave Childs who is, unfortunately, out of town this
11 week. And again, just wanted to extend our appreciation for
12 you being here in our city, our appreciation of giving our
13 local residents the opportunity to not have to travel too
14 far to have their voices heard on this very important
15 project. And so I just wanted to take a moment to thank you
16 for your presence and for this opportunity.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

18 And also from Palmdale, Michael Behan.

19 MR. BEHAN: Good morning --

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

21 MR. BEHAN: -- Mr. Chairman and Members of the
22 Boards. Again, echo what's been said from the previous
23 speakers. Thank you for coming to the Antelope Valley. But
24 I wanted to especially say thank you to your staff who has
25 been exceptional to work with, very professional. And we

1 appreciate that relationship and just wanted to say thank
2 you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, thank you for saying
4 that. We're quite proud of our staff.

5 All right, I have a number of cards. Let me first
6 ask, do we have people in the overflow room or is everyone
7 in this room? We do have people in the overflow room?
8 Okay. So what I'm going to do is I'm going to call out five
9 names at a time. And I'll ask people to take their place in
10 line so that they can come and speak to us. And that way
11 if -- some of the folks that are in the other room, that
12 should give them ample time to -- to transit over here. We
13 want to give everybody an opportunity to speak.

14 We have quite a few speakers here today. So in
15 order to make sure that everybody is heard we're going to
16 ask that people try to limit their remarks to two minutes.
17 Okay.

18 So the first five, and again, these are the order
19 that they were received, Pamela Walter, Kathleen Trinity,
20 Bruce Ganson, Mickey Azola, and John Farrar. If those five
21 citizens could come forward.

22 MS. WALTER: Good morning.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

24 MS. MILLER: My name is Pam Walter and I am the
25 Chairperson of the Coalition, obviously, Against the High-

1 Speed Rail in Acton and Aqua Dulce. And I am also the
2 Chairperson of the Acton-Aqua Dulce Brokers Association. My
3 comments this morning involve directing the route out of our
4 two rural communities of Acton and Aqua Dulce. There is
5 such a route which involve directing the train into the
6 Angeles Forest south of Palmdale and to avoid all Acton
7 homes and businesses.

8 At this point we have already experienced
9 declining property values, people anticipating what the
10 high-speed rail is going to do to our community. We've had
11 people already trying to sell their properties to avoid a
12 loss in their property values.

13 I'm suggesting, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we
14 would like you to, as soon as possible, pick a route that
15 avoids the damage to our two rural communities. This will
16 help us regroup as a community and understand what our
17 future holds. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

19 MS. TRINITY: Good morning, Chairman Richard and
20 Members of the Board. I'm Kathleen Trinity, an Acton
21 resident and former Acton Town Council Member. Supervisor
22 Antonovich has proposed a route that would run partially
23 between the San Gabriel Mountains. However, this route
24 would still impact many homes, ranches, wells and trails.
25 Local Engineer Jackie Ayre wishes to maintain Mr.

1 Antonovich's vision but to tweak it slightly to the east
2 where it could be placed entirely underground and would be a
3 shorter, more direct route that would not impact any Acton
4 aspects. The true cost otherwise would be borne by Acton
5 residents.

6 When Palmdale insisted on a route and a station,
7 did anyone consider that, number one, Acton is a site that
8 is totally inappropriate for high-speed rail? Acton is
9 essentially an echo chamber with numerous canyons and
10 valleys. No matter how much you mitigate, the sound will
11 echo throughout Acton, especially where the train is
12 elevated and at train entrances and exits.

13 Acton is a rural equestrian community. In Red
14 Rover Mine Canyon alone there are 125 rural residential
15 parcels with close to 100 horses. This is probably one-
16 tenth of Acton. In all of Acton people raise, care for,
17 ride horses. A high-speed train will inflict multiple loud
18 periodic noise bursts that seriously disturb the horses
19 which is not -- which is unhealthy, not only for them but
20 for the riders, the caretakers who could be thrown, kicked
21 or trampled. Most studies find increased heartbeat,
22 elevated blood pressure and cortisol levels, along with
23 disturbed sleep patterns in both animals and humans alike.

24 Please, I urge you, please do study this new
25 altered route that would be entirely under the mountains.

1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ma'am.

3 As Mr. Ganson comes forward let me also ask that
4 the next speakers start to line up, and that will be Sandra
5 Madsen, Michael Hughes and Tippi Hedren.

6 Go ahead. Good morning, sir.

7 MR. GANSON: Good morning. My name is Bruce
8 Ganson and I'm from Acton. And I'm very concerned about the
9 high-speed rail going through Acton at 220 miles an hour.
10 The faster the train the more noise it will make. Also, 220
11 miles an hour seems extremely unsafe in our community. What
12 if there is a derailment? You know, the damage will be far
13 worse at 220 miles per hour.

14 So I'm asking, is the train going to go 220
15 through Acton?

16

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Sir, why don't you address the
18 Board. And let me just say that when you have questions
19 like that, there are workshops and other things.

20 MR. GANSON: Okay.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: This is --

22 MR. GANSON: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: This is your time to talk to
24 us. But we'll make sure that you're able to get the
25 information.

1 MR. GANSON: Right. I'm mainly concerned if our
2 rural area is still going to be safe with something that
3 fast barreling through it. Thank you very much.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

5 Yes? Is it --

6 MR. FARRAR: John -- John Farrar.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, John Farrar.

8 MR. FARRAR: Uh-huh.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay.

10 MR. AZOLA: He called -- yeah, he called me next,
11 but let the gentleman go.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Why don't you
13 come --

14 MR. AZOLA: Well, you just --

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- and be ready, sir.

16 MR. FARRAR: Okay.

17

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: So, okay, go ahead, Mr. Farrar,
19 yes, good morning.

20 MR. FARRAR: Thank you, Mr. Richard. And thank
21 you, Board Members. We appreciate the opportunity to
22 comment on this.

23 As a long-time resident of Acton, I've been there
24 nearly 25 years, I chose to move to Acton because of the
25 rural atmosphere, and I'd like it to stay that way. And a

1 train coming right through within, you know, feet of -- of
2 existing homes is a tremendous disruption to the area and to
3 property values, and is already -- remarkably, we've seen
4 already property values decline as a result of the
5 anticipation even of this.

6 We would encourage, I think almost all of us, that
7 alternate route be considered down through the canyon, or
8 shielded in some way from impacting as many homes and
9 residences there. Thank you very much.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Farrar.

11 MR. AZOLA: Okay. Hi. My name is Mickey Azola.
12 I want to warn you, you're not dealing with the sharpest
13 knife in the shed. But Acton is a very special place as
14 it's very unique. And the underground straight to Burbank
15 is encouraging, as long as it could avoid going under any of
16 Acton. So even a little farther east, I think, would be
17 great.

18 Also, I think the blended system has a possibility
19 with a separate track. It could be higher speed to get to
20 L.A. and not make any stops. I think that's a possibility.

21 Anyway, my main issue I'm here for is about water.
22 I think that we should -- it could almost be a priority,
23 maybe it would be easier, I don't know, create jobs. But
24 it's desperate. They almost -- the Vasquez High School,
25 which is in Acton, almost had to shut down construction.

1 They got all the -- after the plans and permits and all the
2 groundwork has been done, they had to go out of town to get
3 water to continue working on the high school.

4 I don't -- how much time do I have?

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead and speak, sir.

6 MR. AZOLA: I come from a lineage of water people.
7 There's a town in Spain named Azola, my last name, that's
8 been providing water there. My grandfather was involved
9 when the dam broke. He worked up at the state, San
10 Francisquito. My dad worked 45 years for Water and Power,
11 my uncle 42. He drove a Fresno (phonetic), if you know what
12 that is, when they prepared the aqueduct. My dad always
13 emphasized the importance of water. I never got involved
14 until -- until now. I'd like to see that happen, too, okay?

15 Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

17 Let me also ask when people are speaking to make
18 sure that everybody could hear, if you could try to speak
19 more closely to the microphone.

20 MR. AZOLA: Should I go back?

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Azola, I'd say that knife
22 is pretty sharp.

23 Ms. Madsen?

24 MS. MADSEN: Hi. My name is Sandra Madsen and I'm
25 a long-time resident of Acton. I'm very involved in my

1 community. We are an unincorporated community, very much --
2 very unlike most of the other communities -- communities
3 you're dealing with. We have crafted over the years, and
4 our predecessors, a wonderful place to live, and we want to
5 protect it at all costs.

6 So unlike some of the other people who have
7 spoken, I -- we don't get anything good from the high-speed
8 rail, particularly, in our community. We get no revenue.
9 It disrupts our lifestyle. It destroys our property values.
10 We've sort of been on hold for a while now, waiting to see
11 what was going to happen and which route was going to be
12 selected. One of the routes -- two of the routes, original
13 routes, were going to go right under my house. That's a
14 scary thought.

15 We implore you to take the route that has the
16 least impact on our community. And I am not going to give
17 you all the details because other people will, and you
18 already have that information, I think. But I implore you
19 to really, really consider how this route can avoid our
20 community of Acton. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Before the next
22 speaker comes up let me just ask other speakers to begin to
23 line up. That would be Jacqueline Ayer, it looks like,
24 Donald Sommen [sic], Lynn David, William Barritt.

25 Okay, sir.

1 MR. HUGHES: Morning. I'm Michael Hughes. I'm
2 also a long-term Acton resident. I am currently president
3 of the Acton Town Council. For you that do not know at this
4 time, Acton is an area defined by a Community Standards
5 District just south and west of Palmdale between Palmdale
6 and Aqua Dulce, before you get to Santa Clarita.

7 What I would advise you to do, if you have the
8 time, is as you're commuting here without the train, drive
9 down, look around Acton. See the lifestyle that is there.
10 See the community that is there. It's -- you have a
11 different perspective when you're there.

12 Our Community Standards District was formed in the
13 late '90s, and the Town Council was formed shortly after
14 that. The Town Council has held many meetings in Acton and
15 adjacent areas for the public of Acton to speak on the high-
16 speed rail issue and the destruction and devastation that it
17 will bring to our community. Several of the routes, the two
18 primary routes, would totally bifurcate our community. Any
19 of the routes currently proposed would have significant
20 impact on houses, property values, as Pam has already
21 mentioned, water tables; it would devastate our community.

22 I urge you to avoid Acton at all costs. You will,
23 in essence, destroy the community if you don't. And I think
24 you will see, just evidenced from this meeting and the many
25 meetings you've had, Acton has been and will be

1 significantly represented to you because of the impact to
2 their community. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Hughes, first of all I want
4 to apologize for not including you earlier in the public
5 officials --

6 MR. HUGHES: Not a problem.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- comment section. And also
8 to let you know that I know a number of my colleagues spent
9 yesterday --

10 MR. HUGHES: Good.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- they came down a day early
12 to -- to go through the route, to have a tour of the route.
13 And so members of this Board are very diligent about wanting
14 to make sure that they have firsthand knowledge --

15 MR. HUGHES: I appreciate that.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- of the high-speed
17 communities.

18 MR. HUGHES: The last slug, as they refer to it or
19 you referred to it, still takes out a bunch of Acton and
20 still devastates some of the community. And I believe
21 speakers that will be coming shortly behind me will be
22 referencing that, as well, so --

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you for coming here this
24 morning, sir.

25 MR. HUGHES: Appreciate that. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Ms. Hedren,
2 welcome.

3 MS. HEDREN: I have my scoping comments here. And
4 I'm talking about a particular business, if you want to call
5 it that, in Acton that I founded in 1972 to rescue lions and
6 tigers. And over a period of years we have rescued and
7 given lifetime sanctuary to over 250 big cats for their
8 lives.

9 Unfortunately, we are right on the Southern
10 Pacific Railroad, which is one of the routes that this train
11 could possibly take. And in this -- these notes has all of
12 the reasons why we would be literally put out of business
13 because of this. And I joked with the radio -- two radio
14 hosts the other day, maybe you've heard of John and Ken
15 in --

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We've -- we've heard of them.

17 MS. HEDREN: They're -- they're not very fond of
18 you about this whole -- this whole --

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: They're in a minority --

20 MS. HEDREN: -- train thing.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- Ms. Hedren.

22 MS. HEDREN: Well, I don't know, but I'm -- I'm in
23 that minority, too. I did their show and, you know, we
24 corroborated on how we felt about the, you know, the train
25 coming through Acton, because they are very fond of the

1 little town of Acton, as well. And it is a place where I
2 have grown to love.

3 I -- you know, horses and lions and tigers don't
4 mix. But in that town the horses are resident, and the
5 horses live in home. There's a horse that lives right next
6 to my hairdresser. And the horses and their humans ride
7 around town and it's beautiful. People come to Acton to
8 retire. It is an absolutely beautiful place.

9 But getting back to the lions and tigers, with
10 the -- and it would have to be an elevated railroad. It
11 would -- the sounds are enormously magnified when that is --
12 that train is -- is raised. There would be no way that --
13 that these animals could survive the sounds and the
14 continuous, continuous trains that everybody is so proud of
15 that you can get -- you know, you can catch a train anytime
16 you want.

17 So I am -- in fact, I made a comment to Ken and
18 John when I -- when I -- my time on the radio show was
19 finished I said, "Are you going to lie down on the tracks
20 with me if they decide to have this the route, and that we
21 will just lie there until those great earthmovers come to
22 change everything?"

23 They said, "Yes, we'll be there."

24 I have a whole bunch of people lined up.

25 I'm kind of interested, are -- are any of you

1 living in an area that's going to be directly affected like
2 Acton? Are any of you -- do any of you live with that
3 monster thought? I guess not, huh?

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Hedren, this is the time
5 for the public to speak. So we -- it kind of puts us in an
6 unfair position --

7 MS. HEDREN: Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- because we (in(audible)).

9 MS. HEDREN: I'm -- I'm sure of that. But it
10 is -- it does occur to me that you might not have the right
11 perspective. That train has no business coming anywhere
12 near Acton, it doesn't. We would benefit for no reason
13 whatsoever.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Hedren.

15 MS. HEDREN: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Next speaker.

17 MS. AYER: Hello. My name is Jacqueline Ayer.
18 And I, first of all, want to thank you for the opportunity
19 to address you. I appreciate the comments made by Mr. Wilk
20 and many others in favor of the direct route. But I urge
21 the Authority to proceed with caution on this route because
22 as it is currently envisioned by the Authority it completely
23 decimates the eastern and southern ends of Acton with noise
24 impacts, vibration, tunnel vibration impacts, well
25 destruction, so on and so forth, and it's not really

1 necessary. Because if you direct the train 3,500 feet to
2 the east of the current slug configuration you can actually
3 put the train directly into the national forest and avoid
4 all Acton homes, and that would avoid all Acton impacts.

5 Now, I know based on what I read in the Notice of
6 Preparation Footnote 1 that the Authority seems to consider
7 compliance with CEQA to be a voluntary issue. However, I
8 want to state here clearly and on the record that the
9 Authority is obligated to comply with every aspect of CEQA,
10 including the provisions that compel the selection of the
11 environmentally superior alternative. I'm also here to
12 state clearly and on the record that there is an
13 environmentally superior alternative for the Palmdale --
14 Palmdale to Burbank segment which does avoid all impacts on
15 Acton, and actually all impacts on everyone south of
16 Palmdale and north of the Angeles Forest southern border.

17 The Authority is bound by statute to select this
18 environmentally superior alternative, and it cannot reject
19 it merely because it's deemed not cost efficient. This is
20 the route that everybody from Acton has been talking about.
21 You can get your direct route and you can still avoid
22 impacts on Acton, and it will not be a significant -- it
23 won't increase travel time, it won't increase anything.

24 So we urge you to consider that alternative as you
25 contemplate this direct route that many people here are in

1 favor of. Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Mr. Sommen?

3 MR. BARRITT: William Barritt. Is that okay?

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, I had two speakers in
5 front of you, Donald Sommen and Lynn David. Excuse me.

6 MR. SOMMER: My name is Donald Sommer. I'm --

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Boy, I'm sorry, sir. I guess
8 it's just me today.

9 MR. SOMMER: It's Sommer. No, it's the way I
10 wrote it down. Sorry, my handwriting. I'm an active
11 resident in Palmdale. I'm in the slug area. And the
12 proposed new route, which is probably the best route, should
13 be on Angeles Forest rim going through the -- the top of the
14 mountain.

15 I have 115 acres. This is probably going to
16 impact me. My well is 1,000 feet deep. All my other
17 neighbors have water trucks going up and down the street.
18 The water is running short, and this is going to heavily
19 impact this thing if it goes through our area.

20 I would really like to say that I would like to
21 have that thing rerouted on the Angeles Forest, the top of
22 the mountain ridge which Jackie was just talking about.
23 That's -- I know you're talking about cost, but this not
24 going to impact anybody by taking it to the top of the ridge
25 and bringing it down through Angeles Forest and getting away

1 from all the homes. Thank you very much.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Sommer. And
3 again, I apologize for mispronouncing your name.

4 MR. SOMMER: That's okay.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Lynn David, good morning.

6 MS. DAVID: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Board
7 Members. My name is Lynn David. I am the Assistant
8 Superintendent of Business Services representing Sulphur
9 Springs School District. I appreciate the opportunity to
10 share some facts about Sulphur Springs Community School and
11 the district's concerns about the plan to have the high-
12 speed rail pass above ground directly behind the school.

13 Here is some information about Sulphur Springs
14 Community School. Sulphur Springs Community School is a
15 kindergarten through sixth grade school that houses 662
16 students and 38 staff members. The rail passes directly
17 next to the rear of the school's property line, as close as
18 20 feet from the playground at some points. A number of
19 classrooms are approximately 300 feet from the rail line.
20 Sulphur Springs has several classes for special needs'
21 students with disabilities that are negatively affected by
22 noise.

23 Sulphur Springs is the oldest school in continuous
24 operation in Los Angeles County, opening in 1872. So it has
25 historical value to both Santa Clarita and Los Angeles

1 County. The district is considering at this time having the
2 school identified as a historical site.

3 Safety concerns would adversely affect the
4 enrollment at the school as parents could ask for and be
5 granted transfer under open enrollment laws. Other district
6 schools do not have the capacity to house these students.

7 While we do support the goal of increasing
8 transportation options for California citizens, the district
9 opposed the above-ground route due to the potential safety
10 risks for students and staff, the interruptions to our
11 instructional program, the impact to site and district
12 transfer requests and lost enrollment, and the school's
13 value as a historical site.

14 The district asks that you support the alternative
15 alignment to bypass our school. Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much, Ms. David.

17 As Mr. Barritt comes to the microphone let me just
18 ask the next five speakers to line up, Stephen Valenziano,
19 Michael Hogan, Jr. -- I'm sorry, it looks like Mr. Hogan
20 twice -- David De Pinto, Gail Wilkie, and Cindy Bloom.

21 Sir, good morning.

22 MR. BARRITT: Thank you. Thank you, everybody,
23 for your time and for your commitment to get this right. I
24 appreciate it, and your patience with everybody that wanted
25 to speak here today. My name is William Barritt. I'm --

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Excuse me one second, sir. I
2 just wanted to make sure that this gentleman can be heard.
3 I know there's -- okay.

4 Thank you, Mr. Barritt. I'm sorry.

5 MR. BARRITT: So as a long-time resident of the
6 Santa Clarita Valley, I've lived and worked there and raised
7 four kids. I live on the west side which is an
8 unincorporated area of the Santa Clarita Valley and
9 Stevenson Ranch. I'm here to represent the -- the
10 community. I'm also on the Chamber of Commerce, as well,
11 for Santa Clarita Valley.

12 But I just wanted to urge all you to -- for the
13 Palmdale direct to Burbank line, nothing above ground
14 through our community. And if we could also consider the
15 forest alternative, going through the forest, that would be
16 fantastic. I would see that as being the best alternative
17 in mitigating the impact to all our communities. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Barritt, for
19 appearing and for your patience this morning.

20 Stephen Valenziano.

21 MR. VALENZIANO: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
22 Board Members. I'm Steve Valenziano from Santa Clarita.
23 I'm the Vice Chair of our local Community High-Speed Rail
24 Task Force. I'm also a development partner in the new job
25 center proposed for the community in Canyon Country-Vista

1 Canyon. And I would just like to reiterate what our mayor
2 pro tem has said and what our councilmen have said. And I
3 think you'll find all speakers from Santa Clarita, whether
4 they are political members or just community members, really
5 have a very unified voice that you're hearing, and that is
6 we very much want this direct route through the forest,
7 Palmdale to Burbank, studies in the EIR.

8 We recognize in the process that you need a number
9 of viable alternatives to pick the one you want. And the
10 tunnel option proposed through our community is technically
11 viable, although we're worried about it. But the one
12 alternative that would be really a disaster for our
13 community would be any surface alignment that would disrupt
14 schools, businesses, churches.

15 And so very clearly the Santa Clarita position is
16 please study the direct option and recognize that the City
17 of Santa Clarita in a united way would oppose, however it
18 had to, any surface alignment through our community, which
19 would no doubt disrupt your schedule to some degree.

20 Thank you very much for your attention and for
21 your fine staff's work over the past several years. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

24 Michael Hogan, Jr.

25 MR. HOGAN SR.: Well, I'm Michael Hogan, Sr.

1 Michael Hogan, Jr. Will be after me.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I --

3 MR. HOGAN SR.: There are --

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- apologize. I --

5 MR. HOGAN SR.: There's not a mistake with the two
6 cards. We're --

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That was my fault

8 MR. HOGAN SR.: That's fine. No, that's fine.

9 My name is Michael Hogan. I have spoken before
10 the Board before as a Board Member of the Sulphur Springs
11 School District. Although now I'm a former board member
12 after 14 years, my concern is still about the safety and
13 education of the children. That's one of the major issues.
14 I'm also a homeowner in Santa Clarita where the high-speed
15 rail currently goes right down the middle of my street at a
16 65-foot railroad trestle which totally destroys a pristine
17 area of Santa Clarita.

18 I am the Chairperson of the Santa Clarita Valley
19 High-Speed Rail Community Committee. This community
20 committee was formed in 2012 at the behest of the High-Speed
21 Rail Authority or the representatives at that time. We --
22 we weren't very organized in Santa Clarita. And it was
23 recommended to us that we form a committee to help
24 communicate with the community business leaders, etcetera,
25 and we did that. And we've been pretty successful in

1 reaching out to all members of the community throughout
2 Santa Clarita, not just the east end.

3 And, in fact, we -- you may have gotten word of
4 it, we had representatives -- Mr. Richard, you were supposed
5 to be at the city council meeting originally that we held in
6 2012 where we actually had sound engineers. And that
7 meeting was held at Sulphur Springs School, which Lynn David
8 was speaking of and how close the track was. We had sound
9 engineers put together a sound demonstration on the sound of
10 the train going by that school while the meeting was going
11 on. And the mayor had to request that the sound be turned
12 off because the meeting was interrupted every six minutes
13 and you couldn't hear anybody speak. And it was an accurate
14 level of sound based on the distance of the track to the
15 school.

16 Anyway, I'm here to ask that the direct alignment
17 be -- from Burbank to Palmdale be considered. The
18 underground alignment or the tunnel extension alignment
19 through Santa Clarita would be our desired route if it goes
20 through Santa Clarita. That currently is not really part of
21 the plan. Right now there's two above-ground alignments.
22 So I would ask that that be approved, the tunnel extension.
23 Although that would still heavily impact Santa Clarita, it
24 would be the best alternative. But the above-ground
25 alignment would be devastating for the community. And we

1 would ask that that be deleted altogether. But we feel that
2 the direct alignment between Burbank and Palmdale is a
3 viable option that really solves a lot of the issues with
4 the various communities in the route.

5 And I thank you for your time. I would like to --
6 I was given a letter at the last minute from a
7 representative from the Sand Canyon Homeowners Association
8 who was supposed to be here but was not able to make it,
9 so --

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: If you can give that to our --

11 MR. HOGAN SR.: Thank you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

13 Now, Michael Hogan, Jr.

14 MR. HOGAN JR.: Yeah, I don't know how I got my
15 name.

16 But anyways, I was born and raised in Santa
17 Clarita. I went to Sulphur Springs Elementary School. And
18 when we did the sound at the school and seeing exactly what
19 it would sound like going there, I can't imagine going to
20 class there now, having to listen to that going through.

21 The train as it is now would also take out all of
22 the houses that are my neighbors across the street from me,
23 and I'd really prefer that doesn't happen.

24 And so I am in support of the Burbank to Palmdale
25 direct route. Because coming through Santa Clarita,

1 especially where it is planned to above ground, is really
2 just an awful path and does nothing good for our community
3 and really doesn't help us out at all. So please consider
4 the Palmdale to Burbank direct route. Thanks.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Hogan.

6 As the next speaker is coming up, let me ask
7 Toby -- Toby Tackitt to Cindy Bloom, Thomas Despres and
8 Pamela Miller to -- so line up.

9 Good morning, sir.

10 MR. DE PINTO: Good morning. My name is David De
11 Pinto and I'm a resident of Shadow Hills which is in the
12 southern part, the bottom part of the yellow swath. That
13 explains why myself and about 30 other people drove up here
14 today, 57 miles, are wearing yellow today. And we
15 appreciate the show of solidarity with your tie, Mr.
16 Chairman.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Anything I can do to show my
18 commitment to the community I'm happy to do, sir.

19 MR. DE PINTO: I'm going to comment about the new
20 alternative. But from what I'm hearing, this is my first
21 HSR hearing, it almost seems like the Palmdale location is a
22 lose-lose situation. No one is going to be happy with the
23 alternatives that are out there now and if you continue to
24 consider what we call the new study alternative or the
25 Angeles Forest alternative.

1 Our area is already overburdened with
2 infrastructure, regional-serving infrastructure projects.
3 We've got 5 freeways, 30-plus landfills, a major power
4 plant, quarries. We have many, many issues. And for us to
5 find out about high-speed rail, literally in the last 35 to
6 40 days, just by receiving this brochure in the mail with
7 the yellow swath -- and then some of our people were able to
8 attend the scoping meetings -- we've only had about a month
9 to process the implications of this. We've submitted
10 extensive comments. We're really just getting started. We
11 hope to be able to nip this in the bud. We have some
12 suggestions on that.

13 Again, my -- my role here today and the role of
14 the folks wearing the yellow today is to try to get this new
15 alternative removed from consideration. We think it was
16 hurriedly and recklessly presented. Again, we had no
17 advance notice from HSR, from the state, from our city
18 representatives or from the county that this alternative was
19 ever going to make its way into the public domain, and all
20 of a sudden we're on the defensive. We feel like we've been
21 attacked. That's how we feel. It's 30 to 45 days and
22 you're not going to hear happy people here today.

23 Legally we ask you to remember the intent and the
24 spirit of the legislation which in Article 2 reads,
25 "In order to reduce impacts on communities and the

1 environment the alignment for the high-speed trail [sic]
2 system shall follow existing transportation and utility
3 corridors to the extent feasible and shall be financially
4 viable as determined by the authority."

5 You'll hear from our speakers today a litany of
6 the environmental issues that this new direct-line
7 alternative presents. There are 15 to 20 of them that
8 you'll hear about today. I won't get into them. We do feel
9 these cumulative environmental impacts are staggering, and
10 that the legislation was clear that areas such as the
11 Angeles National Forest are off limits.

12 We'd also add, with a little bit of CEQA analysis,
13 that an EIR does not have to consider alternatives that are
14 not feasible.

15 I'm almost done.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I would ask you to respect the
17 fact that we have a lot of people who are going to speak.

18 MR. DE PINTO: Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I know you're speaking on
20 behalf of these folks.

21 MR. DE PINTO: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: But they are going to also
23 speak.

24 MR. DE PINTO: Right. We would similarly invite
25 you, and we are having a meeting later this week with

1 Michelle Boehm to tour some of the areas. But we would
2 encourage you to not only tour our area and visit our area,
3 but maybe to have a meeting down in that vicinity so you
4 hear again from the folks in San Fernando and our area.

5 I do indicate that Shadow Hills is linked, and we
6 have a coalition that's just beginning. It's Lake View
7 Terrace, it's Sunland and Tujunga, it's La Tuna Canyon, it's
8 Sun Valley, it's well over 100,000 residents that are
9 impacted at the southern tip of this swath.

10 And I'll just close by saying we've had 30 days,
11 45 days to process the implications of this swath. And the
12 question was raised earlier if any of your areas where you
13 personally reside are in the path of the high-speed rail?
14 We took it upon ourselves to create a map of California that
15 would show some of your hometowns. And what if in the last
16 30 days this just showed up, and unstudied alternative with
17 no specifics, just a 400-square mile area, and you saw your
18 home, your community in the path of the high-speed rail?

19 So thank you very much.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. De Pinto. Let
21 me just assure you and the other citizens, these analyses
22 are long processes, and there's going to be ample
23 opportunity for the public to engage in this. And as a
24 Board we will assure that that happens.

25 MR. DE PINTO: Right. And our request is that

1 this alternative not be subject to a two- to three-year
2 environmental impact report and have that hanging over our
3 heads in a non-specific way, as it is right now.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

5 MR. DE PINTO: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Gail Wilkie.

7 MS. WILKE: Thank you for the opportunity of
8 speaking. I'm a long-time resident of Shadow Hills. I
9 would like you to remove from consideration the Angeles
10 Forest alternate route. The environmental destruction would
11 be incredible. This has been -- has gotten very little
12 consideration, I believe. It would go across earthquake
13 faults, through scenic corridors, through wildlife
14 corridors. It would have to go underground. Getting people
15 out of a tunnel if there's an accident or an earthquake or a
16 terrorist attack is exceedingly difficult. It is quite
17 expensive to go underground. It's quite expensive to repair
18 problems underground. So please do remove this.

19 As -- as a taxpaying resident of the State of
20 California I don't even want to see it go to an
21 environmental consideration and the millions of dollars that
22 would be spent to find that this route is simply not
23 suitable. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Ms. (inaudible).

25 MS. WALKY: Good morning.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

2 MS. WALKY: (Singing.) "Nestled in the foothills
3 of the San Gabriel Mountains, close to all the
4 things I've grown to love, there's nothing like the view
5 looking off into the mountains as the morning sun rises
6 above. And the Terrace, Lake View Terrace, a very special
7 place where you can find lots of secrets, nature's secrets,
8 and if you take the time you'd be amazed at what you'd
9 find."

10 In other countries the powers that be can choose
11 to relocate whole towns and cities full of people without
12 any recourse or warning and demand that they leave or risk
13 not only losing their property, but also their lives. I ask
14 Governor Brown and other politicians and the planners of
15 this project, it owes it to myself and all other
16 stakeholders not to paint this horrible picture of where our
17 country is heading.

18 I've listened to a lot of the people speak. And
19 it appears to me that this high-speed train is a thing
20 that -- do we really need? What about our infrastructure?
21 What about our rail systems that are already in abeyance?
22 Isn't there some way we can tweak and rebuild these
23 structures to make them more feasible for what's going on or
24 for what's being planned?

25 Now four years after certain plans that had

1 identified an existing transportation route seemed to be --
2 seemed like, to me, to be a reasonable concept because I
3 wasn't thinking about everybody else who was going to be
4 devastated and impacted, but now that I've seen how so many
5 people are going to be impacted I'm asking you -- it says up
6 there, "Bright -- Bright Ideas Make Brilliant," what,
7 "Brilliant Futures." Can't we think about this? We have
8 all this brain power here in California and all over the
9 country. Do we have to constantly devastate communities and
10 lives.

11 Please give this some serious thought. Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: The next speaker is Toby
14 Tackitt.

15 MS. TACKITT: This lady actually has said what I
16 would have said, so I decline.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Thank you. Cindy
18 Bloom. And again if I could ask, just so we can make sure
19 that everybody has an equal opportunity for people to line
20 up and be ready, so I have Tom Despres, Pamela Miller,
21 Martha Haukins [sic], Chris Lupton, please line up.

22 Good morning.

23 MS. BLOOM: Okay. Hi. Good morning. Thanks for
24 inviting us here today. My name is Cindy Bloom. I'm a
25 long-time resident of Shadow Hills. And it has become

1 apparent that both -- all the communities affected, whether
2 it's Acton or Santa Clarita, Shadow Hills, Sunland, Tujunga,
3 we all have the same concerns about our declining property
4 values. The houses have actually fallen out of escrows in
5 our area because of this thing hanging over our head.

6 We also have an amazing rural and wildlife
7 environment that will be severely negatively impacted by
8 this -- this proposed route. We have water tables that
9 provide 10 percent of the drinking water for the City of Los
10 Angeles under the Big Tujunga Wash, which is right in the
11 path. We have lots and lots of horse owners. It's zoned K-
12 1 for equestrian property. They will also be negatively
13 impacted. We've got the Big Tujunga Wash. We've got Hansen
14 Dam. We have a whole lot of things that can -- will be
15 negatively impacted if this route is chosen.

16 But -- which makes -- it seemed -- it seems to me
17 that the 14-5 route makes more -- more sense because it is
18 the path of least resistance because it is adhering to an
19 existing corridor which is, you know, by Proposition 1A,
20 this is the law.

21 Now, I want to talk about tunneling. So let's
22 just tunnel. Let's just tunnel through the mountains.
23 Well, right now Big Bertha is sitting underneath the City of
24 Seattle. She's been stuck since December with no end in
25 sight because she broke down or hit an object. It -- she

1 only got through two miles of approximately a two-mile span
2 before she broke down.

3 And based on the map it looks like the path
4 through the mountains is about 15 miles. The cost of
5 tunneling by itself is ten times more expensive than other
6 alternatives, and that's excluding any broken down equipment
7 or hitting unknown obstacles.

8 Last week Big Bertha made headlines when she
9 actually advanced three feet. The big dig in Massachusetts
10 cost overwards of 1.2 billion. The Santa Monica Mountains
11 was stuck for six weeks in 1996. 1995 the tunnel collapsed
12 on Hollywood Boulevard. It just seems that we should keep
13 tunneling to a minimum. And that -- and there's no other
14 way to go through the mountains than to tunnel under the
15 mountains.

16 And I understand my time is up. But to me it's
17 just not a feasible route to tunnel through the mountains,
18 and that the 14-5 Corridor is the most practical and most
19 feasible way of doing this project. Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Mr. Despres, did I
21 pronounce your name correctly, sir?

22 MR. DESPRES: Despres. Thank you. Apologies for
23 any redundancies here because I've heard some of this
24 already. But my names is Tom Despres and I've been a Shadow
25 Hills resident for 17 years. As a community we've been

1 blindsided by this sudden proposal to divert the high-speed
2 rail project from a previously existing corridor to a new
3 study area that would intrude on the inhabitants, not only
4 of Shadow Hills area but the Angeles Crest natural habitat,
5 as well.

6 In what way does this alternative plan meet the
7 requirements and objectives of Plan A which requires the
8 selection of a route that has the least impact on natural
9 habitat as is defined in 2709 which states that the high-
10 speed train system shall be planned and constructed in a
11 manner that minimizes urban sprawl and impacts on the
12 natural environment?

13 If this route were chosen there would be
14 significant negative impacts to the Tujunga Wash flood
15 lines, wildlife corridors, endangered plants and animals,
16 active earthquake faults, pollution, noise and scenic
17 highways. All of this is avoidable if this proposal is
18 immediately withdrawn. The costs and extreme impact of such
19 an undefined proposal are impossible to predict.

20 And I just want to add that no one really seems
21 to -- from listening to everyone, no one seems to want this
22 project to affect them and their communities for obvious
23 reasons. So please don't make this a reason for our
24 community to be held as a scapegoat. Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

1 Pamela Miller, good morning.

2 MS. MILLER: Good morning. Pamela Miller, Lake
3 View Terrace Homeowners and Equestrian Trails Officer. Of
4 course, I understand that we all have to sacrifice for the
5 greater good, etcetera, etcetera. But there's some serious
6 environmental negatives to the alternative route going
7 through the national forest. And then things that -- we
8 went to the scoping meetings and don't quite understand
9 where this will come up and be over or under coming through
10 Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills and La Tuna Canyon.

11 Going through the national forest it's hard to
12 imagine that with the roads, for escape routes for people
13 underneath, wouldn't be an environmental negative to the
14 forest. Okay. Much of this proposed alternative route
15 disrupts the natural watershed into the area that the Army
16 Corps of Engineers and the City of Los Angeles has the 100-
17 year flood route through the canyon where no one can build.
18 You can't even disrupt it. Of course, I'm sure they'll
19 waive that for you. But I've got some of these if you want
20 them, but I'm sure the Army Corps of Engineers has shared
21 with you.

22 This doesn't even say -- it says there's going to
23 be two feet of water at six -- whatever -- feet per -- when
24 the floods come through, those of us who watch it, and it's
25 on the news reels, it's five to ten foot deep. It moves

1 concrete. It moves boulders. And I think that the
2 environmentalists are hoping that somehow this water will be
3 used for Los Angeles where we need it as opposed -- I don't
4 know where you're going to put it. Okay.

5 Acton has businesses -- I don't know where it's
6 going to come up -- but so does Lake View Terrace, hundreds
7 of industries there.

8 Is that time?

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead.

10 MS. MILLER: Horse industries, and not only that,
11 the fire department uses that Little Tujunga Corridor
12 constantly for emergencies. And when there's an earthquake,
13 and the other routes, no one is going to get on that train
14 through a tunnel after an earthquake over Little Tujunga
15 Canyon.

16 I'll stop because I'm out of time.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Miller.

18 MS. MILLER: Thanks.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Next up I next have Martha
20 Haukins, and then Chris Lupton.

21 Ms. Haukins?

22 Mr. Lupton?

23 MR. LUPTON: Yes.

24 MR. LEONARD: Oh, I'm sorry.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: While he's coming up, if I

1 could ask Kathy Delson, Doug Leonard -- Douglas Leonard,
2 excuse me, Ginger Tanner, and Gerardo -- it looks like
3 Barrientos to -- to line up, please.

4 Thank you, sir.

5 MR. LUPTON: Good morning. My name is Chris
6 Lupton. I'm a member of the Shadow Hills community, and I'm
7 here to speak out against the Angeles Corridor alternative.

8 We're a small community down there. There's a
9 number of us that would impacted, Sunland, Tujunga. We've
10 already been bisected by the 210 Freeway. We weren't given
11 much notice of this, so an awful lot has been put together
12 at the last minute. But we want you to consider how the
13 devastation of these communities at the end would be
14 affected by this, going through the forest, the expense of
15 drilling a tunnel.

16 And like I said, we have a beautiful community out
17 there. We don't know what the effect would be on the Big
18 Tujunga Wash. We have a small horse community there that
19 would probably be destroyed as a result of that.

20 So that's all I had to say about this.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. I appreciate
22 your coming this morning.

23 MR. LEONARD: There was a name in front of me.
24 I'm not sure who that was. I'm Douglas Leonard.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, just a second, sir.

1 I have Kathy Delson. Ms. Delson?

2 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: She's in the other room.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, could be.

4 MR. LEONARD: Should I --

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead.

6 MR. LEONARD: -- go before her?

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Why don't you go ahead and
8 speak.

9 MR. LEONARD: All right.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: If she arrives -- Mr. Leonard.

11 MR. LEONARD: Good morning to you all. Thank you
12 so much for having us here. I'll try to be very brief. I
13 expressed the same concerns as those who have been here
14 before you. I'm Douglas Leonard. I come from Shadow Hills.
15 I am the primary caregiver to my 89-year-old mother who has
16 been living there for 46 years, so I feel pretty much
17 ingrained into that community.

18 The proposal that has been put before us is
19 basically -- the thing that got me going was that it's
20 completely without any form for us. We don't know exactly
21 where things are going. I've been astounded by the -- the
22 number of people who have come up who have absolutely
23 specific ideas of where the route would possible go through
24 Acton, etcetera. We have no such ideas at all. We --
25 that's where the fear lies. It's completely beyond our

1 ideas.

2 There's no specific route that has been
3 determined, other than to say that there will be tunneling
4 through 35 miles of the Angeles National Forest, which also
5 gives me great concern that we have many, many problems that
6 have to be overcome in order to tunnel in our area,
7 especially under the Big Tujunga Wash which, as someone
8 said, is an aquifer of ten percent of the water for Los
9 Angeles. That's got to be disrupted by dis-watering -- it
10 has to -- in order to tunnel. I don't think that's viable.

11 According to this little article that I read here
12 it said if we take this alternate route which you're
13 considering, the entire trip would be seven to ten minutes
14 less than the other, the highway route. I don't think that
15 the environmental impacts and the impact on our community is
16 worth seven to ten minutes. I frankly don't.

17 So please, we ask that this not even go any
18 further. There have been seven years, I believe, or years
19 and years of environmental study on the other route.
20 Tweaking is probably necessary. We feel very deeply for the
21 communities that are going to be affected. But we are being
22 affected right now without even knowing the specifics, and
23 that's pretty terrifying.

24 So please, we ask you to just take it off the
25 board. It really is not a viable alternative. Thank you

1 for your time.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Leonard.

3 Did Kathy Delson --

4 MS. DELSON: That's me.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah. I'm sorry, did I
6 pronounce your name correctly?

7 MS. DELSON: Delson. That's correct. Hi. I'm
8 from Shadow Hills, as well. I wanted to acknowledge that
9 there are a lot of lucky people here because we all do live
10 in beautiful communities. I'm sure Acton is. Shadow Hills
11 is another community I think is very, very beautiful.

12 You know, we're -- a lot of you are probably
13 businessmen. I don't know any of you personally, of course.
14 But I would say that how many times have we ever heard that
15 it was a great idea but it was really poorly implemented?
16 And that's something I think we need to keep in mind with
17 this project and this particular segment.

18 I -- my impression or my information is that the
19 existing corridor plan or proposal has been under
20 consideration for many years, but I think someone has said
21 to me seven years. And suddenly Mr. Antonovich has come up
22 with this alternate that he never communicated to his own
23 constituency in our area -- I think it was -- you know, he
24 obviously has talked to other constituency -- but really at
25 the time never even had any communication with our community

1 to know that this was coming. That was a little
2 disheartening.

3 There's been no updated studies recently of the
4 earthquake faults. We have at least three in that vicinity
5 of the foothills, not just the San Andreas. There are --
6 there are two others, as well. There's been no updated
7 studies of gas pockets and other minerals and other issues
8 under the ground there. I don't know if some of you were
9 here, I believe it was in the '70s when they were doing some
10 tunneling for the aqueduct in Sylmar and 20 people were
11 killed because they unknowingly drilled into a gas pocket
12 there. And it's a little disturbing that we really don't
13 even know what's under the ground there.

14 Gee, was that two minutes?

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead and finish.

16 MS. DELSON: Well, anyway, we all know it's very
17 expensive to do the drilling underneath, the tunneling. We
18 have so much existing infrastructure between the freeways,
19 we have DWP Power Plant. We also even have a secret DWP
20 facility there that we don't even know what is done. It's
21 some type of strategic thing, we don't even know. We're not
22 allowed to even know what it is but it's right there in our
23 community.

24 The other thing, the major thing, I think of, is
25 the dewatering issues. If you knew that when they were

1 doing the Metrolink they had dewatering, what they call
2 actual dewatering at Runyon Canyon when they were digging
3 through there, and the spring disappeared. We have a lot of
4 mitigation areas that purposely are situated in the Tujunga
5 Wash so that other things are done other places but we have
6 an area that's specifically designated as environmental
7 banks, if you want to call it, in our area.

8 I thank you for listening.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. The next person I
10 have listed is Ginger Tanner. And with all due respect,
11 sir, that doesn't look like you.

12 So is Ms. Tanner here? Thank you.

13 And Tina Eike, Marsha -- is it Drucker, and Teri
14 Ortiz, please step in line.

15 MS. TANNER: Hi. Good morning, everyone. I am
16 Ginger Tanner. I am a resident of Shadow Hills. And we all
17 wore yellow today because of the yellow swath through the
18 Los Angeles -- or the Angeles National Forest and through
19 Tujunga Canyon and Tujunga Wash. The Tujunga Wash is one of
20 only six ecological systems in the world. This high-speed
21 rail would affect that. Shadow Hills and surrounding areas
22 is only -- is one of only three in the entire San Fernando
23 Valley.

24 And I do not want the, sorry, the high-speed rail
25 through my neighborhood or through Shadow Hills. And I

1 would like the yellow swatch removed from that map, that's
2 the alternate route, and just -- just remove that. Do not
3 even consider us, please. Thank you so much.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Tanner.

5 Is it Mr. Barrientos?

6 MR. BARRIENTOS: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I pronounced that correctly?

8 MR. BARRIENTOS: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good. Good morning, sir.

10 MR. BARRIENTOS: Good morning, Ladies and
11 Gentlemen. I'm just here to express the concern of some of
12 my neighbors about the environmental impact. We enjoy the
13 rural living in Shadow Hills. We think high speed, high
14 speed means a horse running. So we beg you to change your
15 mind about going through.

16 It's older people there that I'm -- they asked me
17 to come and say something about it. They live there. They
18 want to die there. It is country living. They want to keep
19 the water, the fauna -- the fauna. We have enjoyed lately
20 the condors flying overhead. I mean, high speed, it will
21 scare the and the deer, the birds. Please make another
22 decision. We are concerned about the water, the life of
23 the -- all the fauna and, of course, the disruption of our
24 life. Thank you very much.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much. Is it Ms.

1 Eike?

2 MS. EIKE: Eike. Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

4 MS. EIKE: Tina Eike, Shadow Hills Property Owners
5 Association, and also the Small Wilderness Area Preserve.

6 On August 28th Shadow Hills Property Owners
7 Association submitted a letter to you all regarding the
8 alternate route through the Angeles National Forest and the
9 rural horse-keeping communities, not one, communities of
10 Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills and La Tuna
11 Canyon. All of these communities are within the city limits
12 of Los Angeles, as well as the capital flood plain of the
13 Big Tujunga Wash which provides ten percent of the Los
14 Angeles drinking water. And right now we're told not to use
15 our sprinklers. So this is a huge impact on the water
16 issues.

17 Also, finally, the proposal is to go through the
18 pristine Verdugo Mountains into Burbank. So it's --
19 unfortunately, you're not just going into the National
20 Angeles Forest and there's nothing beyond. Beyond that is a
21 very pristine lovely communities, horse-keeping communities
22 within the city limits of Los Angeles.

23 Then -- oh, in that letter that we submitted to
24 you we gave specific negative impacts to the environment and
25 the communities, as well as negative fiscal and social

1 impacts, should the alternative route be chosen.

2 Then on September 11th Shadow Hills Property
3 Owners submitted a supplemental letter which discusses the
4 legal issues relating to the alternative route proposal. We
5 feel these arguments are extremely significant and deserve
6 your utmost attention.

7 The voter-approved Prop 1A Streets and Highway
8 Code 2704.09 provides as follows,

9 " In order to reduce impacts on communities and the
10 environment the alignment for the high-speed train system
11 shall," which means must, "follow existing transportation or
12 utility corridors to the extent feasible and shall be
13 financially viable as determined by the authority."

14 There are no existing transportation or utility
15 corridors in the Angeles National Forest.

16 Furthermore, should the Bullet Train reach the
17 communities of Kagel Canyon, Lake View Terrace, Shadow
18 Hills, La Tuna Canyon, the Big Tujunga Wash and the Verdugo
19 Mountains it will dissect the existing cohesive well-defined
20 communities and will traverse, not parallel, existing
21 transportation corridors. This is the most disruptive
22 possible route and, as a matter of law, cannot be used as an
23 alternate decision and an alternate proposal. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Eike.

25 Marsha Drucker, Teri Ortiz, and then if I could

1 ask Carolyn Moore, Robert Cole, and Toni Ingallina to come
2 up.

3 Good morning.

4 MS. DRUCKER: Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen.

5 My name is Marsha Drucker. I'm here to represent myself
6 and to represent a certain demographic. My demographic can
7 be described as college educated, professional career,
8 concerned about the environment, support for the trust of
9 the public -- public land or Sierra Club. We carry shopping
10 bags into the market. We install solar panels. We remove
11 our lawn and plant California native plants. We carpool.
12 We grow some of our own food. And we make a distinction
13 between our own personal interests and that of the greater
14 community. That is why we voted for Prop 1A in 2008.

15 Now, we can also distinguish between the
16 propositions, the summary bullet, and this was in the
17 proposition, quote, "Improve existing passenger rail lines
18 serving the state's major population centers." Between that
19 and a proposal which cuts through Southern California's best
20 environmental feature, the Angeles National Forest, source
21 of 10 percent of our drinking water and so much more, we can
22 also distinguish between good ideas and bad ideas.

23 We would not need a hearing or an EIR in order to
24 know that tunneling under the Pacific Ocean, a more direct
25 route, is a bad idea. We can also see that using existing

1 passenger rail lines and transportation thoroughfares is a
2 better idea than a banana afterthought. That is a
3 ridiculous idea for too many reasons to elaborate. But the
4 most important one is that it was not part of Proposition 1A
5 which we voted for.

6 And as a former English teacher I would like to
7 say that there is an attempt to direct this conversation by
8 calling this the direct route, which it is not. It is the
9 illegal route. And with that it does not comply with
10 Proposition 1A. Thank you for your time.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Please.

13 MS. ORTIZ: Hi. My name is Teresa Ortiz and I'm
14 here opposing the alternative route for the HSR. As she
15 said earlier and other people have said earlier, I feel like
16 I've been blindsided because I did vote for Prop 1A. And I
17 feel like you're making adjustments which we didn't vote
18 for. And I don't understand and I can -- I understand how
19 it's affecting the livelihoods of Acton and these other
20 communities.

21 You know, we are -- I moved to Shadow Hills
22 because it was a great environmental rural community where
23 you're close to the City of Los Angeles and you're -- you
24 feel like you're out in the country. And it's a great
25 country lifestyle, which I'm sure Acton has and the -- Lake

1 View Terrace, etcetera. My concern is I don't understand
2 why you can't improve -- like these schools that they're
3 saying why you can't soundproof them and put your money
4 towards the soundproofing and making the area better for
5 them if you're going to go through the -- the 5 Corridor and
6 the 14 Corridor, which I voted for, and spend the money.

7 Because that's what Burbank Airport does. You
8 know, they ended up paying for soundproofing homes that are
9 around there because they were getting bigger jets or more
10 jets or whatever. Why can't they do that along the
11 proposed -- the original proposed freeways?

12 And I just wanted to let you know that I'm -- I'm
13 opposed to the alternative.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Thank you, Ms.
15 Ortiz.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay, let me ask people to line
17 up. We have -- next is Carolyn Moore, followed by Roberta
18 Cole, followed by Toni Ingallina, Shelli Andranigian, and
19 then Maria -- is it Mejia?

20 MS. MEJIA: Yes.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes?

22 MS. MOORE: Good morning.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

24 MS. MOORE: I'm Carolyn Moore. Thank you for the
25 opportunity to speak today. I'm from Sand Canyon Homeowners

1 Association. And basically I would prefer that you change
2 the route to make it directly from Palmdale to Burbank and
3 bypass our sweet little canyon that will be impacted by
4 plenty of noise. And barring that, if you could please
5 tunnel underground past the entrance to our canyon. Thank
6 you very much.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Moore.

8 Ms. Cole? Robert Cole? Roberta Cole? Okay.

9 Toni Ingallina? How did I do with that?

10 MS. INGALLINA: Ingallina. That's good.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ingallina.

12 MS. INGALLINA: Hi. I'm Toni Ingallina. I live
13 in Shadow Hills --

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Speak up a little bit.

15 MS. INGALLINA: -- and I don't public speak.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's all right.

17 MS. INGALLINA: We've only just learned about this
18 alternate, and it is pretty obviously environmentally unsafe
19 and not per the law. And I think you can easily see it just
20 by observing the area. And I don't think a report, an
21 expensive environmental report is even necessary. So I am,
22 as a resident there, opposed to the project at all, even
23 going any further.

24 And somebody had said earlier that money doesn't
25 really matter that much when you're trying to save homes and

1 whatnot. But I contend that there's already been quite a
2 bit of money spent. I pay a lot of taxes and I don't think
3 another report is necessary. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

5 Yes, ma'am, you are?

6 MS. COLE: I'm Roberta Cole --

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

8 MS. COLE: -- from Shadow Hills. And I have been
9 a member of this community for over half a century and, of
10 course, not only Shadow Hills but beyond, Sunland, Tujunga,
11 Lake View Terrace, the whole area. And I'm here to -- and
12 thank you, first of all, for allowing us to come. And I
13 encourage you to review and consider all the aspects, all
14 the facets each of our members are bringing out. It's from
15 legal aspects, environmental aspects, every area we're
16 bringing to you. And I really want to encourage you to look
17 at everything objectively, intellectually, and arrive at
18 solid decisions. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Cole.

20 As Ms. Andranigian is coming up, followed by Ms.
21 Mejia, I'd ask Donna Lauber, Fred Arnold, Kerry Briggs and
22 Rich Poston.

23 Ms. Andranigian, you're a long way from home.

24 MS. ANDRANIGIAN: I know. Good morning, Chairman
25 Richard, EO Morales and Members of the Board. I happen to

1 be wearing a yellow wristband. And this is to prevent
2 mosquitos. And I wanted to let you all know that I am here
3 in solidarity with everyone who has concerns about this
4 project.

5 Good morning. My name is Shelli Andranigian. And
6 our impacted family farming operation is in the Fresno to
7 Bakersfield section. Since I am also addressing many not
8 familiar with the area, we are in the San Joaquin Valley,
9 aka the Central Valley and South Fresno County, along the
10 cold slew (phonetic) of the Kings River.

11 I would like to know why you are addressing
12 changes to the Land Conservation Act of 1965, also known as
13 the Williamson Act as it pertains to the farmland of Fresno
14 County, agenda item eight. This topic should not be
15 discussed or decided upon here at the California High-Speed
16 Rail Authority Board meeting today in Palmdale which is in
17 Los Angeles County. Why is this important issue not being
18 addressed in the Central Valley where farmers are in the
19 midst of the busy harvest season and not able to be here,
20 which is 200-plus miles away, for them to publicly comment
21 and question? Could it be because both Fresno County and
22 the City of Fresno have each recently passed items
23 unfavorable to the California High-Speed Train project,
24 including a resolution to reverse their previously favorable
25 stance of HSS the past seven years by the Fresno County

1 Board of Supervisors this past July 29th?

2 Those in California's Central Valley federal and
3 clothe -- clothe everyone in this room and the rest of the
4 world. Farmers are the true environmentalists and stewards
5 of the land. This action not only disrespects them but
6 everyone who cares about the environment. The California
7 High-Speed Train project is not the green project the
8 authority wants everyone to believe.

9 I urge you table any action on the Williamson Act
10 which will negatively impact over 70 properties in Fresno
11 County and bring it up at a future Board meeting in Fresno.

12 No mention of this action was even broached at the Fresno
13 County Board of Supervisors in July 2014 at which both CEO
14 Morales and Vice Chair -- spoke before the board one week,
15 and Vice Chair Richards, Tom Richards, at the next meeting
16 or even at recent meetings. I am here -- I am sure those
17 here in Los Angeles County would not be pleased if a similar
18 action impacting their properties was discussed in Fresno
19 County at 9:00 a.m. on a weekday.

20 Those behind the scenes at the California High-
21 Speed Rail Authority have been in a rush to connect a train
22 from San Francisco to Los Angeles, yet they have not planned
23 on how to get from just north of Bakersfield to here in
24 Palmdale. The Authority will need a rail line to traverse
25 the mountainous ridge route, aka the Grapevine, that bridges

1 Southern California with the central and northern areas of
2 our golden state. Meanwhile, family farms, private homes,
3 small and larger businesses, churches, schools, historical
4 landmarks, and the Fresno Rescue Mission which has been
5 providing a home for the homeless since 1949 remain
6 negatively impacted.

7 I have a few more paragraphs. I spoke 30 seconds
8 at the last meeting a few months ago.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead.

10 MS. ANDRANIGIAN: Okay. Thank you. Rogue
11 appraisers, including those from out of state, have been
12 running rampant in the Central Valley. They have been
13 harassing elderly female homeowners, along with those who
14 farm the land, in the midst of the busy harvest season. The
15 appraisers must be in a rush to get paid by the authority
16 before the funds run out. Those who ask the appraisers for
17 more information so they can note the exact impacts to one's
18 property by requesting a large and legible map are not taken
19 seriously and are asked if said individual needs something
20 for all impacted properties. Why would someone only need a
21 large and legible map for Property A and not for Property B,
22 C and D? A neighbor's map sent by the appraisers even has
23 the rivers near the farm labeled incorrectly.

24 Two more paragraphs.

25 I am not sure if the California High-Speed Rail

1 Authority Board realizes the inept actions of those
2 representing them on the front lines. The largest
3 infrastructure project of its kind remains flawed because of
4 continued missteps, like those just mentioned. Who in
5 California would want a train speeding through their
6 communities at over 200-plus miles per hour when no thought
7 continues to be put into the planning process at every
8 level?

9 It is high time to put the horse before the cart
10 and hit the restart button to make it precise at every step
11 of the way so those who prefer train travel, such as myself,
12 will get to experience it in their lifetime in California,
13 hashtag, no one will be able to ride until then.

14 Thank you, and safe travels.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Maria Mejia? Yes?
16 Good morning.

17 MS. MEJIA: Good morning. Good morning, Board.
18 My name is Maria Mejia. I'm an environmental attorney. I'm
19 a CEQA attorney. My business address is in Burbank, and I
20 lived in Shadow Hills for over 17 years. This high-speed
21 rail project is divisive. Communities are being put against
22 each other when it similarly impacts adversely each
23 community, as we have heard this morning.

24 Really, what should be the focus is a no-project
25 alternative to this high-speed rail. Significant adverse

1 impacts of this project include land use and planning,
2 noise, vibrations, wind, carbon dioxide emissions, and
3 wildlife such as the national forest. For example, with
4 respect to land use and planning, there's going to be a
5 massive amount of eminent domain. No one wants their home
6 taken. The reason you are asked whether your homes were in
7 the path of the high-speed rail is because you would think
8 differently about this project if it was going to destroy
9 your home.

10 The -- the high-speed rail is going to be
11 traveling at approximately 200 miles per hour or more.
12 There is an excessive effect with a train going at that
13 speed. There -- there has to be significant buffers on
14 either side so that it doesn't knock down people on the --
15 in the outskirts of it. And there's just a significant
16 amount of adverse impact with noise and wind at that
17 velocity.

18 With respect to carbon dioxide emissions, there
19 are more emission with tunneling, approximately seven times
20 more than if you had the high-speed rail going at the
21 surface open-space level. That needs to be taken into
22 account. So it's misleading to say that the project with
23 this high-speed rail is going to reduce carbon dioxide
24 because it's going to have less people on the road.

25 Sorry, if I may -- if I may continue just a bit

1 longer.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Please, go ahead, finish.

3 MS. MEJIA: Thank you. States such as Florida,
4 Ohio and Wisconsin -- Wisconsin decided not to proceed with
5 the -- with the project. So that project was killed in
6 those states, and that can be done in California.

7 Trying to force -- what's happening is Metro and
8 the High-Speed Rail Authority is trying to force the public
9 to use public transportation. I'm going to give an example.
10 You have the FasTrak lanes on the 10 Freeway going east and
11 west, let's just say from the downtown area. What has
12 happened is people now have to pay for those FasTrak lanes.
13 And what it does is it creates more traffic at an earlier
14 time. And I know this personally because I used to travel
15 that freeway and I used to try to get on the freeway on
16 about 3:30 to avoid the peak-hour traffic. Now I have to
17 get on the road an hour earlier at about 2:30 if I'm going
18 to go in that direction.

19 So what happens sometimes is people are not paying
20 to use the FasTrak lanes. So then we have more -- we
21 have --

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I want to focus on the high-
23 speed rail, and we've got --

24 MS. MEJIA: Well, it's connected --

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I understand.

1 MS. MEJIA: -- because Metrolink is connected to
2 the high-speed rail. And it's a point of trying to force
3 people to use public transportation, and it's not working.
4 And this is just one example where people are not paying to
5 use the Fastrak lane so then it creates more traffic on the
6 other lanes.

7 And then I'm just going to wrap up with this
8 saying eminent domains -- eminent domain displaces a lot of
9 people from their homes. That's a land use issue and
10 that's -- that really needs to be taken into effect. And
11 one of the problems when trying to -- when you're engaged in
12 eminent domain is the question is what is a reasonable value
13 that I need to pay you for taking your home. And there's a
14 disagreement because the homeowner wants the maximum amount,
15 the fair amount, and the government wants to pay as little
16 as possible.

17 Thank you for your time. And I'd like to just
18 mention that Martha Hankin's [sic] name was misstated.
19 She's a Shadow Hills resident. So she's here to speak, and
20 it's Martha Hankin. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Next is Donna -- I'm
22 sorry.

23 MS. HANKINS: Well, I'm Martha Hankins, so I
24 better come up.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm just trying

1 to take things in order.

2 MS. HANKINS: Okay.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's all right. I'm sure
4 I'll get to you. Go ahead.

5 MS. HANKINS: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Just better for people to wait
7 until --

8 MS. HANKINS: Would you like me to wait?

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: If you would, please.

10 MS. HANKINS: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We'll get to you. Everybody
12 will have a chance to speak.

13 Donald Lauber, please, followed by Fred Arnold.
14 And then Kerry Briggs.

15 Good morning.

16 MS. LAUBER: Hi. How are you? I hope I'm a
17 breath of fresh air, because I know this is such a serious
18 meeting. I don't think it's fair that you all are being
19 browbeaten to death over, in my opinion, was Antonovich's
20 folly. I think it's the worst idea the man has ever come up
21 with. I almost had a heart attack when he said it because I
22 couldn't believe it. He's so responsible for so much open
23 space all over L.A. County. So it's kind of shocking to
24 have this happen to us through him.

25 The -- the thing that bothers me the most is

1 nobody wants it. I think you really need to take that into
2 deep consideration. You are brilliant, obviously, or you
3 wouldn't be sitting here and you wouldn't be able to do the
4 magnificent things you've done all over the world. I
5 believe that it's within your power, especially your brain
6 power, to come up with a better solution than this for all
7 of us, for everyone in this room. Because you can see it's
8 divisive.

9 Many of us are horse people. This is really not
10 appropriate for the type of lifestyle that we live. And we
11 don't want to be your enemy. And we certainly want to work
12 with you, and we want to build L.A. But we don't want to be
13 crushed. And I'm, you know, I'm praying and I'm imploring
14 you to please listen to every one of us and take into
15 consideration the extreme impact it would have on so many,
16 not just a few. And I hope that you come up with a solution
17 that works for all of us, not just for business, and one
18 that makes L.A. a better place, not, you know, another 710
19 Freeway to nowhere. We really need a solution here and I
20 don't think this is it. And I believe that you can come up
21 with it but I don't think we're there yet, and I don't think
22 you are either.

23 And I just want to say how much I respect you as
24 business people and all the incredible accomplishments
25 you've done, but we really need you to listen to us, we

1 really need you to feel us. We need you to visit our
2 communities and see how we live and see what you would
3 really be taking away from us. We have nowhere else to go,
4 that's the bottom line. We're horse people.

5 So I stand up for the horse people. And I hope
6 that you come out and take a ride on a horse and experience
7 what it's really like to live our lifestyle. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

9 Fred Arnold. And then again, if Kerry Briggs,
10 Rich Poston, it looks like Sandra Cattell and Lee Anne Eager
11 could line up.

12 Mr. Arnold, good morning, sir.

13 MR. ARNOLD: Good morning. It's been some time,
14 President Richard, since I met you, seen you again. It's
15 good to see you again, and respective Board Members. I'm a
16 representative of Briggs Field Services. And Kerry Briggs,
17 the president, is out speaking with your attorney. And I'm
18 going to just defer any discussion. We were a little
19 confused on whether or not we needed to be here today to
20 address this item. So we thought it would be best to be
21 here than not to be here.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Right.

23 MR. ARNOLD: But I'm getting some assurances that
24 our issues have been addressed.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I understand that.

1 MR. ARNOLD: And so we really appreciate it. And
2 you have a spirited discussion, a lot going on, so I'm going
3 to defer any further discussion (inaudible). Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. And I take it that that
5 also means Mr. Briggs. Does he want to speak or is he --

6 MR. ARNOLD: I don't think he needs to at this
7 point, but --

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. I'm looking at him.
9 But, yeah --

10 MR. ARNOLD: Yeah. We're, yeah --

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Okay.

12 MR. ARNOLD: We're fine. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much, sir, and
14 good luck.

15 Rich Poston, and then Sandra Cattell, Lee Anne
16 Eager, Wendy Williams.

17 MR. POSTON: Good morning, Chairman Richard and
18 our distinguished Board. I'm Rich Poston. I'm the Vice
19 Chair of the Antelope Valley African-American Chamber of
20 Commerce over Governmental Affairs, in addition to Economic
21 Development. I'm also a member of the State Council of
22 Chambers, and a member of the NCTC.

23 I echo some of the remarks that were made by our
24 mayor regarding conducting the meeting here. We know what
25 it took to have you come here. We appreciate you coming to

1 the center of the universe.

2 On behalf of the people that I represent I urge
3 you and the entire Board to support Palmdale in their
4 request, and politely ask Metro, and I have some Metro
5 friends in the audience and I don't want to disrespect them,
6 to add the rail component as part of the analysis of the SR-
7 138 Avenue D from the I-5 to the Highway 14 corridor. It
8 only makes sense at this particular time to do that because
9 it's -- it lays the foundation and springboards us into the
10 future for what we would be doing years to come.

11 So we -- we urge you to -- to consider that. And
12 I also, on behalf of the people that I represent, want to
13 consider the tunneling, as Supervisor Mike Antonovich also
14 has requested, to go from Palmdale to Burbank. Thank you
15 for your time.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir. It's good to
17 see you again.

18 Sandra Cattell, good morning.

19 MS. CATTELL: Good morning.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Proud Sierra Club member, I
21 see.

22 MS. CATTELL: Yes, I am. And you know the Sierra
23 Club has always been in favor of high-speed rail as part of
24 an integrated network of public transit. We've not always
25 been in agreement on your routes, though.

1 The Angeles Chapter which represents all of Los
2 Angeles and Orange Counties favors a direct route from
3 Burbank to Palmdale. I'd like to thank you for vetting the
4 I-5 and 1-14 route. I hope you also enjoyed hiking historic
5 but seismically active Elsmere Canyon. The route that goes
6 along the I-5 and the I-14 impacts many, many more
7 communities. It's very circuitous.

8 The -- and by the way, I want to say to everybody,
9 no one is in favor of disrupting any communities. And
10 hopefully you're going to find a way to protect all these
11 communities. I don't know how, but I hope you will find a
12 way.

13 I will tell you the existing route will impact the
14 Santa Clara River Watershed and the many creeks that feed
15 into it from the San Gabriels, and they form a natural --
16 they form a natural river that replenishes aquifers from
17 Acton to Ventura. The direct route will shorten the trip by
18 miles and minutes.

19 And again I'd like to ask you to consider the
20 direct route from Burbank to Palmdale avoiding homes, not
21 through the Angeles Forest but tunneling beneath it. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much.

24 Lee Anne Eager, also a long way from home.

25 MS. EAGER: Thank you. Lee Anne Eager. I am from

1 the Fresno County EDC and I'm pleased to be back in Palmdale
2 again. I was here a few months ago with one of my board
3 members talking to Mayor Ledford and his team about what
4 Fresno has done in the last five years to prepare for this
5 and what we're looking to do in the future as far as
6 economic development.

7 One of the little pieces of advice I forgot to
8 give him was you've got to get tough skin. When it was
9 first announced that Fresno was going to be the start of
10 high-speed rail we heard things like it was a train to
11 nowhere, and we got our feelings hurt. And we heard someone
12 in Los Angeles say it was the train from a place that no one
13 wants to live to a place that no one wants to go, and we
14 were offended. We heard the -- the things about -- that no
15 one lives out in the tumbleweeds, and we got a little
16 defeated.

17 But it wasn't until our local folks started to say
18 we don't want this here, that this is too much trouble, we
19 don't want to have to work that hard, that we finally got
20 mad. And I think you saw that last time when 50 people got
21 on a bus at five o'clock in the morning to come and tell
22 you, hell, no, that's not who we are, that's not what we
23 want. And it isn't only that we want that in our backyard,
24 we finally realized we deserve that in our backyard.

25 And I think after talking to the folks here in

1 Palmdale, they deserve this project in their backyard, too.
2 They have some of the same issues that we do. Okay, I lied
3 about the tough skin. Sorry. We don't want to go -- have
4 to go around the country and around the world and sell our
5 communities as those places where we have high unemployment
6 and high poverty, so come here because we have cheap land
7 and we have cheap labor. We don't want that anymore for our
8 communities. And this project will be what changes that for
9 both of us, for all of us, and they see it and we see it.

10 One of the things that the folks who were on that
11 bus and the thousands of people that they represented when
12 they came last month, they wanted to make sure that I told
13 you today was that they thank you for continuing to support
14 us in Fresno County, even during those times that we forgot
15 to support ourselves. So thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Let me call -- I
17 really want to make sure I get this right. Is it Martha
18 Hawkins [sic]? How do I spell it?

19 MS. HANKINS: Hankins.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: So apparently what I did was
21 mispronounce your name before I didn't know that you were
22 being called, and for that I apologize to you.

23 MS. HANKINS: That's okay.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you for your patience.
25 Could you please give your name and give us your comments?

1 MS. HANKINS: Okay. I'm Martha Hankins and I've
2 been a resident of Shadow Hills for 30 years, and I am
3 definitely against the project. The reason -- well,
4 everybody has touched on everything, but just a little
5 lightly on this. We are in an earthquake area. We have --
6 we've had two major earthquakes in our mountains, the
7 Northridge Earthquake and the Sylmar Earthquake. That is
8 definitely right where the -- where the slug, you know,
9 comes through. And the thought is terrifying that it's
10 going to either be you're going to put the train over the
11 mountains, under the mountains, blasting through those
12 mountains. It's just, you know, a very terrifying thing.

13 So that was the point that I wanted to make.
14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, thank you. And, again,
16 thank you for your patience.

17 MS. HANKIN: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Wendy -- Wendy Williams,
19 followed by Alan Scott, and then Paul Dyson and July
20 McKeehan.

21 Ms. Williams from the Antelope Valley Transit
22 Authority.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Here I am.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, there you are. I had to
25 run around from the other side.

1 MS. WILLIAMS: Yeah. No worries. Good morning,
2 Chairman Richard, Members of the Commission. My name is
3 Wendy Williams. I'm the Director of Communications for the
4 Antelope Valley Transit Authority. And we are here today to
5 let you know that we are very excited about high-speed rail
6 being in our region. We do support the Palmdale to Burbank
7 Airport route. We are here to talk about -- I am here to
8 talk about the commuters out there, the 60,000 to 75,000
9 commuters who head into Los Angeles every day who are not
10 taking public transportation.

11 We strongly support public transportation. We
12 have 22 runs that go over the hill, commuter coaches that go
13 over the hill every day, and they're full to capacity. And
14 I could put a 100 buses out there and they would fill up to
15 capacity because it's inexpensive, it's very affordable.

16 My question is: Why aren't they hopping on the
17 Metrolink? Why don't we have Metrolink every 20 minutes
18 coming up to Palmdale and heading back into L.A.? Because
19 Metrolink takes an hour-and-a-half to get down to Union
20 Station, and then another half hour to get to another
21 connecting route to get where you need to go. And for that
22 pleasure it costs you about \$30.00 round trip. So you're
23 not saving any time and you're not saving any money.

24 With 60,000 to 75,000 commuters what's it going to
25 take to get them out of their cars? High-speed rail. If we

1 could get 25,000 people into -- into a high-speed rail down
2 the hill, that's greenhouse gas reduction. That is truly
3 good for our environment.

4 We support public transportation. We know it is
5 the future of California. We know our state supports it.
6 We support it. We support our commuters who aren't here
7 today because they're working in Los Angeles. And they
8 would let you know that they would prefer an alternative
9 that got them there much faster, and they'd be willing to
10 pay for it. Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much. Alan
12 Scott, also a long commute for you today, sir.

13 MR. SCOTT: Good morning.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning.

15 MR. SCOTT: Alan Scott, a Kings County resident,
16 proud resident. I'm proud of being a resident there in
17 Kings County, the eighth largest sector of actual county in
18 the United States of America.

19 I had a prepared speech. Once again the
20 quality of the speakers has charged me to say a few things.

21 Number one, the first alignment to be approved was
22 the Merced to Fresno. That's probably about 90 miles, I
23 believe, something like that, 60 to 70 or whatever. Right
24 now the alignment is only 25 miles. That's from Avenue 17
25 north of Madera in the middle of nowhere to Fresno, which is

1 25 miles. It's fractured. So what I'm going to talk about
2 right now is fracturing, the truth.

3 The truth is that the first alignment is not a
4 whole alignment, it's only 25 miles. The second alignment
5 was approved in May. It was from Fresno to Bakersfield.
6 Well, right now, if my understanding is correct, it stops
7 somewhere around County Line Road which is the southern end
8 of Tulare County, the northern end of King -- Kern County.
9 So that's -- there's a space there between there and
10 Bakersfield. Right now there is no EIR that I know of out
11 for Bakersfield to Palmdale, so we're fractured again. So
12 connectivity being used is wrong.

13 But I'm going to go back to what I have a problem
14 with; I am a taxpayer, as everyone else in this room is.
15 And everyone uses the comment about the interstate highway
16 system. Well, if memory serves me correctly the interstate
17 highway system was built with money in the bank. They
18 didn't build the next section until the money was in the
19 bank. We have no money in the bank. We're a broke state
20 and we are not -- have no money to even finish the first IOS
21 section. So you're about, I think, somewhere between \$25
22 billion and \$31 billion short. I don't know where you're
23 getting it from. There's no money in the -- in the budget.

24 The other thing that kind of bothers me is the
25 fracturing, and I've got just a couple of seconds. The one

1 thing that fractures me is the fracturing, the seven fault
2 lines you guys are going to go through somewhere on
3 either -- all the way down here. I find that absolutely
4 amazing. I find that absolutely amazing.

5 But I want to read something that came out of the
6 Business Journal out of Sacramento, quoted by Mr. Morales.

7 "‘If someone were coming in looking to just make a
8 profit by running trains and,’ parenthesis, ‘the current
9 plan is,’ closed parenthesis, ‘probably not how they would
10 have done it and they would have bypassed all those
11 population centers,’ said Morales.”

12 That's just an excerpt of the statement. The
13 interview was the -- the Business Journal from Sacramento.

14 Thank you very much.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Scott.

16 Mr. Dyson? Mr. Dyson, I got your letter and I'll
17 be responding. Good morning.

18 MR. DYSON: Good morning. Good morning, Mr.
19 Chairman, Members of the Board. Paul Dyson, President of
20 the Rail Passengers Association of California. We're a
21 nonprofit all-volunteer group. We are supporters of this
22 project, although some of you may sometimes question that
23 but we are strong supports of this project.

24 And while you're here in Palmdale I hope you've
25 taken the opportunity to ride the existing Metrolink Service

1 between here and Los Angeles. If you haven't, you really
2 should. Because what it will point out to you is that this
3 rail line is completely obsolete. It was built in the 1870s
4 and has not been -- hardly been straightened out or improved
5 since, apart from having the track renewed. Its operated
6 with 1960s thinking equipment. And as other speakers
7 pointed out, it takes far too long. This is not the route
8 that is acceptable for the 21st Century. We need a new
9 railroad between here and the San Fernando Valley. It
10 should be the top priority of this Board to -- to build that
11 section next.

12 I do not know which is the best route to take, and
13 I don't pretend to be an engineer. I -- we -- and I don't
14 think anybody in this room has sufficient data to make any
15 kind of decision. Suffice it to say, though, that we have
16 discussed over the last many years, and it's included in
17 Prop 1A, the -- the route via the freeways. Whether that
18 turns out to be the best decision or not, I don't know.

19 Let me just quickly be parochial. I serve also on
20 the Transportation Commission for the City of Burbank.
21 Burbank will be on the high-speed rail, like it or not.
22 There are those that have said what about a no-project
23 solution. No project is not acceptable because there's no
24 such as no project. We are -- right now have Burbank split
25 in half by yet another widening of Interstate 5, adding

1 carpool lanes and additional lanes. It's being done, and I
2 could be nasty about this, but it's being done to
3 accommodate the people of Santa Clarita and Acton and
4 Palmdale and all the other people that use Interstate 5. So
5 no project is not good enough.

6 We need a modern electrified railroad to serve our
7 region and to connect the two ends of the state. And
8 without modern transportation we have no prosperity. So
9 keep it up. We're supportive. Thanks.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. What I'm going to
11 do is take two more speakers, and then we'll give the
12 transcriptionist a slight break. It's been two hours. She
13 said -- she said, "Thank you." I don't think that was going
14 to appear on the transcript until I repeated it.

15 Julie McKeehan, followed by Ron Miller.

16 Ms. McKeehan, so your -- your card is up here,
17 sir. You'll be --

18 MR. MILLER: Two more hours?

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: No. It's about 30 minutes more
20 speakers after we take a break, so Ms. McKeehan --

21 MS. MCKEEHAN: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- from the AQMD. Good
23 morning.

24 MS. MCKEEHAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and
25 Members of the Board. My name is Julie McKeehan. I'm

1 representing the Antelope Valley Air Quality Management
2 District. The District supports the high-speed rail project
3 for two important reasons, improvements in air quality.
4 Fewer cars on the road -- excuse me, I'm -- I just came in
5 here. I'm a little winded. Fewer cars on the road means
6 improved air quality in the state. California's urban areas
7 have some of the poorest air quality in the nation. The
8 Antelope Valley is -- is affected by the poor air quality in
9 the urban areas because it is transported by the prevailing
10 winds in our area. The transport air pollution has a very
11 definite negative effect on our local air quality.

12 In addition to transport air pollution from
13 adjacent urban areas, it is estimated that there are over
14 60,000 cars per day that leave the Antelope Valley to
15 commute to work into the Los Angeles Basin. Access to
16 quick, efficient public transportation would directly
17 benefit the citizens of the Antelope Valley. Fewer cars and
18 a train that uses clean energy means cleaner air.

19 The second is reduction in greenhouse gases.
20 California leads the nation in working to reduce the level
21 of greenhouse gas emissions. In 2006 the State Legislature
22 passed Assembly Bill 32, also known as the Global Warming
23 Solutions Act, that directs the state to reduce statewide
24 greenhouse gas emissions to year 1990 levels by year 2020.
25 High-speed rail is part of the state's greenhouse gas

1 reduction strategy. It is estimated that the high-speed
2 rail project will have a significant effect on reducing the
3 state's greenhouse gas emissions.

4 Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. McKeehan.

6 MS. MCKEEHAN: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. I'm going to Ron Miller
8 from Building Trades. Mr. Miller, good morning.

9 MR. MILLER: Good morning. Good morning, Mr.
10 Chairman, Board Members. I just want to start out by first
11 thanking Mayor Ledford for putting this venue together and
12 allowing you guys to come down and see us today. And if I
13 was a farmer in the Central Coast I think I'd be up around
14 4:00 in the morning, I could have made it down here.
15 Because I got up at 4:00 this morning to come up here from
16 L.A. And it would have been a lot slower if we wouldn't
17 have had a freeway system. We would have been coming up
18 here in horse and buggy. So these projects do bring a lot
19 to the community. They bring progress. They help drive the
20 local economy.

21 I'm an advocate on behalf of 140,000 craftsmen and
22 women in the L.A. and Orange County area within 48 different
23 local unions across 14 different trades. We have many
24 thousands of members that live up here in this area, Santa
25 Clarita and in L.A. And I'm here to express my support,

1 continued support, and reiterate that we will remain strong
2 advocates of the high-speed rail.

3 This is one of the largest projects in the nation.
4 Construction of the high-speed rail in California has
5 already begun. We've got shovels in the ground in Central
6 California.

7 You heard Councilwoman Murray from Anaheim talking
8 about her beautiful project in Anaheim, the ARTIC. That's
9 part of the high-speed rail whether anybody wants to admit
10 it or not because that's where we're going with it. And
11 it's almost done, so we're waiting.

12 We're going to put many thousands of workers to
13 work on this and we're going to create many careers paths
14 through entrance into our apprenticeships. This is what
15 drives the local economy. The Mayor of Palmdale is a smart
16 guy. He knows that a station here in Palmdale is going to
17 help develop his community and allow many of his people to
18 go to work here instead of going down the hill, but it will
19 also create a path for people to get down the hill and to
20 work in an efficient manner.

21 Thank you, and let's get to building.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

23 Okay, we're going to take -- is a five minute
24 break sufficient for you? A ten minute break? We'll take a
25 ten minute break. It will be a ten minute break. When we

1 come back -- when we come back, Laurie Hunter, then Frank
2 Oliveira and Nancy Woodruff.

3 (On the record at 11:08 a.m.)

4 (Off the record at 11:19 a.m.)

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. If we could -- if
6 we could please take our seats. Could I ask everybody to
7 take their seats.

8 And let me just ask our staff, since seats seem to
9 be opening in this room, if -- Mr. (inaudible), do you know
10 if there still people in the overflow room?

11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I can check.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. Yeah, why don't we
13 check and see if perhaps we can get everybody into this room
14 at this point. I never thought I'd say these words, but it
15 seems a little cool here in Palmdale today.

16 All right, so our next speaker is -- if I could
17 ask the following people to kind of line up and get ready so
18 we can -- so I can have everyone speak, is Laurie Hunter,
19 followed by Frank Oliveira, Nancy Woodruff, Ed Shaver, and
20 it looks like, I want to say, is it Debra Shaver?

21 So Laurie Hunter? Yes.

22 MS. HUNTER: Good morning, and thank you. I work
23 for -- as staff to the High Desert Corridor Joint Powers
24 Authority. And the High Desert Corridor is the connectivity
25 between Palmdale and a private line from Victorville you're

1 going to be hearing about later on the agenda, the
2 XpressWest. And I have one of my board members here. Our
3 board is made up of both County of San Bernardino and County
4 of Los Angeles, Antonovich and Lovingood. And then we
5 have -- my Board Member Jim Ledford is here. We also have
6 members of each of the cities that the High Desert Corridor
7 touches. The other ones would be Victorville, Adelanto,
8 Apple Valley and Lancaster.

9 Our purpose is really to stimulate and make
10 progress on getting the High Desert Corridor built as a
11 highway and rail project with a green energy corridor
12 attached to help power and transmit energy to the grid from
13 solar farms nearby. That project is having a lot of trouble
14 getting funding, but we are about to release our
15 environmental document. The draft environmental document is
16 due out next week. So we're making progress with getting
17 our -- getting environmental clearance on the project.

18 But one of the things that our board is next going
19 to grapple with is how do we finance it? The public-private
20 partnership angle is going to be coming up. And we have
21 intense interest in getting the -- the most passengers to
22 use the tracks that connect the XpressWest system with the
23 California High-Speed Rail system, the most passengers using
24 it.

25 So we want to make sure that you know of our

1 interest in scoping and getting to -- and expediting your
2 environmental studies, and possibly along with that the
3 passenger counts that would come from each alternative, the
4 tunneling alternative, using -- using all of them so that we
5 can look at all of the systems in California and find out
6 how can we get the most people riding the system.

7 So to that extent we really favor expediting the
8 Union Station to -- to Palmdale leg. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Hunter. And
10 thank you for your work on the High Desert Corridor.

11 Mr. Oliveira, also traveling a long distance
12 today. Thank you, sir.

13 MR. OLIVEIRA: Glad to be here. My name is Frank
14 Oliveira. I'm the co-Chairman of Citizens for California
15 High-Speed Rail Accountability. We're from Kings County. I
16 Came here today to hear what you were going to convey to the
17 people here about destroying their communities, and that
18 there would be a credible process, there would be an EIR,
19 that you would sensitively look at this, your staff would
20 work with them and you'd come up with the best solution.
21 I'm here to say that didn't happen in Kings County. There
22 are Board Members here who didn't keep their promises. We
23 will not be made whole. Your right-of-way agents have told
24 us that.

25 I wanted to tell the Board also that other

1 problems from the beginning that we asked about, like
2 landlocked properties caused by slicing through the middle
3 of properties, how would we get access to the other side of
4 the tracks? Some of you have stood there on the tracks and
5 looked at the simple question we're standing here, how are we
6 going to get over there so we can continue to use our
7 property? We've been told by your right-of-way agents that
8 there was no provision for giving access. There would be no
9 access to our landlocked properties, and that's not part of
10 the plan.

11 We asked that question for four years, or at least
12 I've asked that question for four years. That was the basic
13 question that we started with. Which leads me to believe,
14 what are you going to tell these people? That this process
15 is fair? That you'll evaluate all the information you
16 receive from your staff and you'll come forward with a wise
17 decision about what gets destroyed and what isn't? That
18 you'll find out later, after the EIR process is done, that
19 the mitigations that are important to your community are no
20 mitigations at all?

21 So I'm here to tell you, that's why there are no
22 less than 15 lawsuits on the second page of your agenda.
23 And if anyone here wants to talk about lawsuits and what to
24 do to dismantle this project, they can see me after the
25 meeting. Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Nancy Woodruff, followed by Ed
2 Shaver, and then Debra Shaver.

3 Good morning.

4 MS. WOODRUFF: Good morning. Thank you all for
5 allowing us to come and see your patience as to why not in
6 our backyard, because I'm sure you've been getting a lot of
7 this up and down the state.

8 At any rate, my name is Nancy Woodruff. I happen
9 to the be the Vice President and Land Use Chair for a number
10 of years for both the Foothill Trails District Neighborhood
11 Council in Los Angeles, and the La Tuna Canyon Community
12 Association. Foothill Trails happens to be the largest
13 neighborhood council as far as area, but one of the lesser
14 as far as population. We represent approximately 26,000
15 residents. Okay. Within the yellow swath there is more
16 involved than that. So our -- the community that we're
17 representing, which I might say at this point has just been
18 hysterical for the last two or three weeks, is -- is a
19 sizeable one.

20 The EIR information, I'm not even going to go into
21 that. You -- you have had a number of reasons here already
22 today as to why the community is against it. If we proceed
23 to the EIR I'm going to be writing, probably be a number of
24 pages, and we will go into that.

25 But one of the things that I wanted to bring up

1 really is that -- and I'm kind of outspoken in this room, at
2 least as far as our group regarding this, is that there are
3 a number of our stakeholders, and they're in my son's
4 generation who are, believe me, really looking forward to
5 the high-speed rail. They want to see an alternative of
6 getting from LAX to San Francisco in what they consider to
7 be the same amount of time. I mean, they really want to see
8 it happen.

9 But as soon as this came forward, and I've got to
10 admit, we have seen Michelle over the last three or four
11 years. She comes at least annually to let us know what's up
12 with high-speed rail. The last meeting -- just let me
13 quickly finish --

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead.

15 MS. WOODRUFF: -- was in -- on July 19th, which
16 was not all that long ago. The PowerPoint, again, did SR-14
17 as the same PowerPoint we've been getting for years now.
18 And then all of a sudden we were told, "No."

19 And people asked me, "Well, what's this yellow
20 swath?"

21 And I'm going, "She was just here. She was
22 talking about SR-14. This is the reality."

23 And I've been told, "No, no, no, no, it isn't."

24 At any rate, the younger generation, stakeholders
25 that talk to me because I'm a mom of a couple of kids that

1 age, have said, "What do you mean they're going to tunnel
2 ten miles underneath two active fault system, the San
3 Gabriel Fault system and the Verdugo Hills Fault system?
4 That's ten miles. Oh, my god. I want to ride it but I'd be
5 scared to death because of these thrust fault system in
6 taking the route." So you might want to consider that. The
7 ridership that you're looking for is going to be really kind
8 of leery, and they want to see it run. Thank you very much.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you much. Ed Shaver?
10 Mr. Shaver? And then it looks like Debra Shaver. Okay.
11 Susan Mansis, followed by Greg Bowan [sic], followed by
12 Linda Campanella Jauron, it looks like, if I didn't
13 mispronounce that.

14 Ms. Mansis?

15 MS. MANSIS: Yes. Good -- good morning. It's
16 still morning.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

18 MS. MANSIS: Yes, my name is Susan Mansis. I am
19 the -- sorry, I have my notes on my phone. I am the Vice
20 President of Shadow Hills Property Owners Association which
21 is a part of L.A., and you've heard from many of us before.
22 I would like to point out that the supporters today, or the
23 great majority of them at least, are government,
24 transportation, air quality, union employees, and they are
25 paid representatives. I don't believe we've heard many

1 people from the private sector support this. Our city
2 council member, unfortunately, was blindsided by this, as
3 were we. We wish he was here today, but I don't believe
4 that he would be in support of this either.

5 Shadow Hills Property Owners Association known as
6 SHPOA, has existed for 50-plus years to preserve and protect
7 our trails, our open spaces and our wildlife communities.
8 We are constantly bombarded by developers threatening our
9 property values, our established scenic corridors, our
10 watershed pathways, our dams, waterways, both above and
11 below ground. Please don't throw the rail under any or
12 through any mountain passes. Stick to the original route
13 which the voters voted in in 2008. We were led to believe
14 it was going to be along existing lines. And now we're
15 completely confused because it doesn't seem like it's going
16 to do that at all.

17 The -- the people who are supporting this so-
18 called direct route really don't realize where it's going
19 because it's not been clearly defined yet. And the people
20 who are supporting going through the Angeles Crest Mountains
21 don't understand that there's a whole lot of communities in
22 the East San Fernando Valley that that's going to affect.
23 The communities are, as you know, Shadow Hills, Lake View
24 Terrace, Sun Valley, Sunland, Tujunga, even parts of
25 Burbank, and that's quite -- quite a big swath.

1 In 2008 we were going to -- we believed that it
2 was going to be along existing rails and it was going to
3 cost X amount of dollars. As you know, it's grown
4 exponentially since then. And I hate to say that we were
5 lied to, but in a way we -- we have no choice. The mountain
6 passes are supposed to be protected from developers, and I
7 don't understand why we're even considering going through a
8 national forest. We elect -- we elect all of you
9 representatives to represent our interests, and this is
10 clearly not in our best interests.

11 Metrolink ridership is declining while the cost of
12 Metrolink tickets are rising. I don't know why we would
13 think that a high-speed rail would be able to be any more
14 effective or efficient or -- or, you know, affordable.

15 So I'd say just don't -- please don't break
16 up our community, threaten our property values or our open
17 spaces by running tracks, trestles or tunnels through our
18 open spaces and wildlife corridors. Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Is it Greg Bowan?
20 Bolan [sic]? Teamsters? Bashan?

21 MR. BASHAN: It's probably Bashan. I'm Greg.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Wow. All right, let me do
23 this --

24 MR. BASHAN: Yeah, that's --

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- Teamsters Local 986.

1 MR. BASHAN: That's me.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Is that you? That's fine.

3 Let's go. Followed by Linda Campanella -- is it Joron or
4 Jauron?

5 MS. CAMPANELLA-JAURON: Jauron.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Jauron. Excuse me.

7 MR. BASHAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

9 MR. BASHAN: I apologize for my handwriting.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's all right, sir.

11 MR. BASHAN: Hey, I'm just here as a resident of
12 Lancaster that makes that commute on the 14 four days a
13 week. And anything that's going to kind of, not eliminate
14 but reduce that traffic I'm for. So I heard a lot of people
15 speaking about the -- their -- their communities being
16 disrupted and, you know, I hear them. But, you know, the
17 traffic coming out this area going down into Santa Clarita,
18 and then from thereon into Los Angeles is just -- it's
19 horrendous. And so a high-speed rail, I know that Wendy
20 Williams spoke about ridership would probably go up if it
21 was a quicker -- not so many stops, and an hour-and-a-half
22 to get to Union Station. I believe that, too, because I
23 have taken the Metrolink. It's nice but it's slow.

24 So I look forward to any alternative routes that
25 you guys come up with. I just want to see it get built.

1 Because as a Teamster, and I was a resident and now I'm a
2 Teamster, it's going to help people get back to work, and we
3 need people to work.

4 So please move it along if you can. And I'll ride
5 it if you guys build it. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Bashan. Sorry
7 for mangling your name.

8 Ms. Jauron?

9 MS. CAMPANELLA-JAURON: Jauron.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Jauron.

11 MS. CAMPANELLA-JAURON: And it always gets
12 mangled. My name is Linda. We'll stick with Linda. And I
13 live in the City of San Fernando. I've only lived there for
14 33 years. So, you know, I'm a newcomer there. And I have a
15 few notes, not too many.

16 You heard from several of our council members
17 earlier about how the -- the proposal through our city will
18 impact us. First of all, we were disappointed that you
19 couldn't schedule this meeting so that more San Fernando
20 residents could attend because this project is of great
21 importance to us. We are a working-class community. And
22 people can't take off in the middle of the day in the middle
23 of the week to come to a meeting no matter how close it is,
24 frankly, because they work for a living. And they're kind
25 of an upper -- and underrepresented minority. I guess it's

1 an underrepresented majority.

2 Please don't ghettoize -- please don't ghettoize
3 our beautiful little city by constructing the above-ground
4 route through our community. If we must have high-speed
5 rail please choose another option. Any above-ground rail is
6 unacceptable to the City of San Fernando. We're only 20
7 blocks by 12 blocks, 20 -- I mean, 20 blocks by 12 blocks.
8 And yet we have 24,000 residents and almost 9,000
9 households. That's very compact. And it will influence our
10 community in a way that is unimaginable in a 20 by 12 block
11 area.

12 The proposed route will nearly cut our community
13 in half. The City of San Fernando is historically
14 significant. It's a community which has faced and conquered
15 many challenges over the years. We are working so hard to
16 maintain and upgrade our neighborhoods and protect our
17 business districts, our fragile business districts. Please,
18 please choose another alternative and save our city from
19 what could be literal destruction, and that will be your
20 responsibility. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, ma'am.

22 Michael Liikala, followed by Mitch Klein. And
23 then Kris Gangadean, I think it is.

24 Mr. Klein, if you could get ready, Ms. Gangadean.
25 Scott Rowe after that.

1 Good morning, Mr. Liikala.

2 MR. LIIKALA: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I'm
3 Michael Liikala with Solutions International. We work with
4 the -- with large U.S. and international construction and
5 engineering companies. And I also come here with over two
6 decades of experience as a federal regulatory of business
7 and a U.S. diplomat focusing on international business.

8 And I just wanted to make the point that -- that
9 both myself and a lot of the international firms are
10 encouraged by your decision to focus the latest efforts on
11 the High Desert Corridor and the connections to L.A. and
12 Anaheim, and even to Las Vegas. We know that there are
13 numerous policy issues that need to be discussed and
14 resolved. And your efforts to get the public input, like
15 you're doing today, are commendable and, of course, must
16 continue.

17 We know that there are issues to discuss like
18 safety and cost, the environmental impact, liability,
19 delivery of the system, etcetera, and those are complex
20 issues. The private sector certainly defers to the public
21 sector to make the ultimate decisions on those matters, but
22 we wanted to let you know that the private expertise is --
23 is ready and willing to help analyze these issues and
24 demonstrate how some of them have been resolved in projects
25 around the globe. There are certainly evidence and existing

1 projects in operation that have dealt with some of the
2 safety issues in tunneling, the environmental impacts, the
3 issues of tunneling through mountains, cost efficiencies,
4 risk taking, risk sharing, and financing.

5 And I think the sooner you get engaged with --
6 with those kinds of discussions with -- through industry
7 forums or whatever, I think you'll find that many of the
8 issues that the public are raising now have been addressed
9 internationally and can be addressed in this project in ways
10 that bring broad public benefits, help reduce greenhouse
11 gases, reduce commuting time and enhance public safety, and
12 do it at costs that are probably significantly lower than
13 what some of the estimates are so far. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much. Mitch --
15 Mitch Klein?

16 MR. KLEIN: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good morning, sir.

18 MR. KLEIN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and the
19 Board. My name is Mitch Klein. I'm with the International
20 Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local 11 Los Angeles, and
21 we do cover this area. I'm a 33-year resident of Antelope
22 Valley. I'm here to speak in favor of the high-speed rail.
23 I hope we can appease everyone and come up with a solution
24 for a route that everyone could be happy with.

25 But as a business representative I want to let you

1 know what I'm dealing with. I'm dealing with people that
2 are hurting financially, and they're hurting for jobs. I'm
3 dealing with people that are losing their homes, having
4 their cars repossessed. They can't even feed their kids
5 because since the downturn of the economy it just hasn't
6 really picked back up yet. And the good thing about this
7 high-speed rail is that it is going to provide good jobs,
8 decent paying jobs, jobs with benefits, jobs that we need so
9 badly.

10 The good thing that I feel that's also on this
11 project is that it's going to have local hire. And what's
12 even better is that we can take our veterans, our heroes
13 that are coming back from the war, and provide them with
14 decent careers and good jobs. And not only that, we're able
15 to take at-risk youths off the streets and give them decent
16 careers and jobs through our apprenticeship programs.

17 I think that's about it then. That's -- that's
18 what I wanted to say. So --

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

20 MR. KLEIN: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I hope I pronounce this
22 correctly. Kris Gangadean -- Gangadean, followed by Scott
23 Rowe, Carol Locus. The person from Santa Clarita, Kris
24 Gangadean? Okay.

25 Scott Rowe? Carol Locus? Okay. Followed by

1 Tamara Loperfito.

2 Ms. Locus, go ahead.

3 MS. LOCUS: Thank you for the opportunity of
4 public comments and for all being here.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Could you speak up a little
6 bit?

7 MS. LOCUS: Okay. Thank you for being here and
8 giving us this opportunity. The main thing I want to say is
9 when everyone talks about Lake View Terrace, Shadow Hills,
10 all that, there's also a little community called Stonehurst
11 which is a historically protected overlay zone. I just
12 wanted to say that. So we're part of, you know, the fear of
13 losing.

14 I just wonder about the eminent domain problem. I
15 know eminent domain takes care of fair market value. But
16 what about if you could live in your house before you retire
17 10 or 15 more years and you still owe a mortgage, I don't
18 think eminent domain takes on the consideration of the loss
19 of that ten years of paying off your mortgage and living
20 there. So I just wanted to raise that issue. I'm going
21 to -- I'll write letters about it.

22 The other thing is we voted for the HSR to be on
23 existing transit lines. So I believe that with all the
24 public outcry along all the corridors that you've -- are
25 considering, that there seems to be maybe even more than the

1 voters who approved it. So I think maybe we need to vote on
2 it again.

3 The other thing is if Burbank -- if you are going
4 to go directly to Burbank from here you're cutting out all
5 the riders, possible riders that really need it to
6 compensate, alleviate traffic. And -- and then Burbank
7 would become a hub where I don't know if the existing
8 infrastructure would allow people to actually go to Burbank
9 to take the train in either direction. I don't know if
10 Burbank could absorb that traffic.

11 The other thing is AB 32, there are many people,
12 for governors, Neel Kashkari for one, running on revoking it
13 for many, many reasons, but mainly that carbon taxes are,
14 many people consider, a hoax with, you know, CO2 and the
15 global warming, it's mainly scientifically debunked. Also,
16 California is the only nation in the -- nation right now
17 running off of that type of a policy. It causes energy
18 prices to go up. And I believe that it's a Catch 22 where
19 you're losing your tax base. I know my utility bills have
20 gone up. I maybe leave because the utility is so expensive.
21 But just to consider the source of your funding could go
22 away, because I think people are waking up that it's not the
23 best way to -- to save the environment. It's not saving the
24 environment.

25 The other issue is along the whole route, when

1 people get off the train where are they going to go? If
2 there's no supporting shuttle or public transportation
3 that's reliable how are they going to go to their office, to
4 their home? And that's why if somebody in Palmdale
5 wanted -- or somebody in Santa Clarita wanted to go to San
6 Diego they have to drive to Burbank, so you're adding more
7 congestion.

8 Thank you very much for this opportunity, for
9 listening. And I hope you read all of the comments. And I
10 wrote a five-page letter which I raised other points. Thank
11 you very much.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Okay. Tamara, is
13 it Loperfito?

14 MS. LOPERFITO: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Followed by Bruce -- is it
16 Pique or Pique?

17 MS. LOPERFITO: Ladies and Gentlemen, thank you
18 for giving us your attention today. I'm Tamara Loperfito
19 here from the fragile ecosystem within the yellow swath that
20 provides one of that last refuges for an equestrian
21 lifestyle.

22 As a Metrolink rider I agree, improvements are
23 needed to the existing commuting system, but that's not why
24 we are here. In my humble opinion, much pain to all
25 represented communities and much treasury can be saved by

1 bypassing Burbank altogether. The rail segment can go
2 directly to Union Station hub and allow Burbank-bound
3 passengers to take the 15 minute ride via the existing
4 Metrolink. I would ask you to reconsider the alternative.
5 Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Mr. Pique, you've
7 been very patient. I'm sorry, somehow your card got
8 misplaced but --

9 MR. PIQUE: That's not a problem. I really
10 enjoyed the lady who sang. And I was basically going to do
11 a tap dance for everybody.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm going to speculate, Mr.
13 Pique, that you're not going to be as talented as she was.

14 MR. PIQUE: You should see my daughters and my
15 wife.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Pique, before you start, if
17 I could just ask, is it Gerri or Gary [sic] Summe and Nicole
18 Parson, and Brian Saeki to -- to line up behind you.

19 Sir?

20 MR. PIQUE: Well, thank you for letting me speak
21 today. I'm a citizen of Acton. I was hoping to kind of be
22 with my -- my fellow Actonites there to help kind of
23 summarize some of the things that we're thinking. But as
24 I've listened to everybody today one thing I've noticed is
25 that most of the people who are seeming to be positive about

1 the rail are politicians or union leaders or working for the
2 government. I'm hearing a lot of citizens questioning this
3 and whether or not the entire project even makes sense any
4 more. What's the purpose of this thing?

5 I am a 20 -- a 30-year software sales executive.
6 And I commute from here to San Francisco all the time, and I
7 have no problem getting there from Burbank or LAX. I don't
8 need a train to get there.

9 It was my understanding that the original intent
10 was not to go through Palmdale at all. And I -- I recently
11 had a personal meeting with Supervisor Antonovich and talked
12 about some of these issues. And he informed me that some of
13 these lawsuits that you guys are talking about affected some
14 of these things. And I'm not -- I'm not an expert so I'm
15 not going to speak to it, but there could be there was a
16 lawsuit that caused the train to go through Palmdale. There
17 could be a lawsuit that caused the development of this new
18 slug because the people in Santa Clarita don't want it. I
19 don't know, but I've heard some of these things.

20 What we do know is that the -- the town of Acton,
21 which is not a city, we're not represented by a mayor and --
22 and city council, we have one legal representative and
23 that's Antonovich and his office, he's always been a
24 supporter of our community. And as Sandy Madsen said, we
25 have worked with him for years to craft a community that is

1 a country lifestyle on purpose without the -- the
2 entrapments of the city. And Supervisor Antonovich
3 supported the library and the park and all the things that
4 we have done in our community. And it was literally only
5 one month ago, maybe six weeks ago we even found out about
6 the fact that there was going to be this possible new route,
7 this slug. And I don't know if any -- if you have seen this
8 thing, but this is the slug.

9

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Pique, if I could ask you
11 to address your comments to the Board.

12 MR. PIQUE: This is the slug, okay? This is
13 Acton. There are 350 homes there the slug goes through. We
14 don't know if it's going to go right through our homes. My
15 home is right there. I've lived here 15 years. I brought
16 up two daughters, very good dancers, by the way. You know,
17 so I'll try to summarize.

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead, please.

19 MR. PIQUE: One of the things that I was
20 disappointed about when I went to several of the local
21 meetings that we were invited to in Acton was when we found
22 out this is supposed to be a green project. The train is
23 not an electric train. It's a diesel train. So this is not
24 a green project.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Sir, I need you to -- I need

1 you to wrap up. But I also need to just say that that's not
2 correct.

3 MR. PIQUE: Well, Michelle Boehm is the one who
4 told me that.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Mr. Pique, other
6 people --

7 MR. PIQUE: Okay. So I'm going to summarize.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

9 MR. PIQUE: If this -- if this project is going to
10 go through and the slug is to be considered the citizens of
11 Acton have spoken with Supervisor Antonovich and believe
12 that the existing slug could be moved 3,500 feet to the east
13 and to the south and affect zero homes or buildings or
14 residences or animals in protected environments in the
15 cities/towns of Acton, Aqua Dulce and Santa Clarita by
16 moving it 3,500 feet.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, sir.

18 MR. PIQUE: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Gerri Summe? I'm having
20 trouble with names today. I want to get it right. How do
21 you pronounce your name?

22 MS. SUMME: That's fine. It's Gerri Summe.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Summe? Okay.

24 MS. SUMME: Thank you for the opportunity to speak
25 with you all today. My name is Gerri Summe. I am a three-

1 year resident of Shadow Hills. But more importantly I'm a
2 native Californian born in San Francisco, and I've lived in
3 California my entire life and have been in L.A. now for over
4 25 years. As the years go by I've become more and more
5 concerned about the overdevelopment of California.

6 I grew up in a world where the 101 had two lanes
7 going each direction and had signal lights as you passed
8 through my home town of San Rafael. And there was no
9 Highway 5. And when it went in people ran out of gas all up
10 and down the freeway because there were not enough gas
11 stations. Now there's gas, McDonalds and a Starbucks
12 opening at every exit in place of what used to be farms.
13 And instead of those farms of avocados, oranges, olives and
14 apricots that I used to draw on my third grade California
15 geography maps, we now have a bunch of political signs
16 talking about the dust bowl and the -- that the politicians
17 have created and how the farms are disappearing because the
18 farmers can't get enough water at a fair price.

19 I reluctantly accept the notion that you can't
20 stop growth. And I'm aware that nothing that I say today
21 will stop this train or stop the ongoing quest for speed in
22 California. But I firmly believe that when we make
23 decisions such as these that will impact generations to come
24 we should think long and hard before overriding the original
25 will of the voters by plowing through a pristine national

1 forest instead of following existing transportation
2 corridors.

3 This train was supposed to be done with a focus on
4 minimally affecting the environment. The detailed 21-page
5 letter that was submitted to you by SHPOA has already
6 outlined in detail the wildlife issues with this plan.

7 When -- when I was at the Burbank scoping meeting
8 I asked several people, "Who is the they that they kept
9 talking about that are so committed to the shortest and
10 fastest route?" And all -- could I have a few --

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Go ahead and finish.

12 MS. SUMME: -- a few more seconds -- all responded
13 simply, "Antonovich."

14 I believe that Supervisor Antonovich has made a
15 calculated political decision to try to appease his
16 constituency in the Santa Clarita area, and we should never
17 make a permanent decision that will impact our children
18 based on the number of voters that a single politician has
19 in one area versus another.

20 To conclude I just want to ask you to consider
21 that the bill that was approved by the voters does state
22 that,

23 "In order to reduce impacts on communities and the
24 environment the alignment for the high-speed train system
25 shall follow existing transportation or utility corridors,"

1 and, "the high-speed train system shall be planned and
2 constructed in a manner that minimizes urban sprawl and
3 impacts on the natural environment."

4 Please obliterate this alternative route proposal
5 and save Angeles National Forest and the precious equestrian
6 neighborhoods of Shadow Hills, Lake View Terrace and La Tuna
7 Canyon that lie beneath it. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Summe. Nicole
9 Parson, and then Scott Rowe. Nicole Parson from Another Way
10 Design and Engineering? Ms. Parson? I'm sorry, is that
11 you, ma'am?

12 MS. PARSON: Yes, sir. I'm sorry, I have nothing
13 at this time.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Nothing? That's it? Okay.

15 Scott Rowe, and then Brian Saeki will be our last
16 speaker.

17 Mr. Rowe, I did call you before but I guess that
18 didn't come through. But anyway --

19 MR. ROWE: I didn't get it. All right. Just a
20 few -- the upper Santa Clara River Watershed is pretty
21 important. There's -- I researched. There's apparently
22 been no hydrological studies done on it, where it comes
23 from, how it feeds. There's a lot of sensitive species,
24 both endangered and threatened, in that watershed.

25 The U.S. Forest Service has been mapped literally

1 hundreds of archeological sites along this corridor, this
2 proposed corridor. And if you're lucky they may let you see
3 where they are. They're considered top secret.

4 The impact on all the residents in Acton is going
5 to be pretty bad. Basically, you're going destroy
6 communities, like the same thing down below.

7 I keep hearing about the commuter train. The
8 Palmdale-Burbank, as I understand it, was never envisioned
9 as a commuter train. It's only because you needed to get to
10 San Francisco. And it seems like now it's all of a sudden
11 become a commuter train to drum up more support for it. And
12 Michelle brought it up months ago, pulling traffic off the
13 14. And then abruptly is was never mentioned again until
14 this meeting.

15 That's about it. I just -- I think it's a
16 tremendous waste of our money. I don't believe you have any
17 private funding at this point. You have letters of intent
18 which I think we all realize what those are. That's it.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Mr. Rowe.

20 Our last speaker.

21 MR. SAEKI: Mr. Chair and Members of the Board,
22 thank you for allowing this public interaction. My name is
23 Brian Saeki. I'm the City Manager for the beautiful City of
24 San Fernando. And we had a long meeting last night. It
25 went about an hour-and-a-half or two hours of public

1 comments. Well, I can sympathize what it's like to be on
2 that side of the table.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: you consider that long?

4 MR. SAEKI: Well, yeah, for us that's long. So
5 I'll keep my comments brief.

6 We've had several residents and several of our
7 council members speak about the issue. And one of my many
8 duties as a city manager for San Fernando mainly really is
9 the physical and orderly development of the community. And
10 what I can say is the SR-14 route at grade will be
11 devastating to our community. Again, it will split it in
12 half. Many of our very scarce commercial areas will be
13 taken through eminent domain, so we're very concerned about
14 that.

15 San Fernando, as I'm sure a lot of people in this
16 room can attest to, is coming out of a tumultuous past. We
17 are on the right path of making improvements and creating a
18 community that everybody can be proud of. And so we don't
19 want this to come through there at -- as it's proposed for
20 the SR-14. We are not saying that we're -- we're not
21 opposed to high-speed rail, we are not. We strongly
22 recommend that the Board consider the alternative study that
23 goes through the -- the Antonovich study, I guess, is if you
24 will -- you want to call that.

25 So I'll leave my comments brief. Thank you very

1 much, and thank you again for taking public comment.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, thank you, Mr. Saeki.

3 Whew. Okay, I want to close the public comment
4 session by just saying that we appreciate the fact that
5 citizens took time from their day to come and speak to us.
6 We understand these issues are difficult. And I want to
7 assure you that my colleagues and I and our staff will give
8 every consideration to what you've said to us today. There
9 will be continuing dialogue. There will be many
10 opportunities for public input. And we understand this is
11 important to you and we take your comments very, very
12 seriously. So I want you to know that you have been heard.
13 And I know that this has been an imposition on many of you
14 to come here, but we appreciate the fact that you did. So
15 with that we close the public comment session.

16 We'll move to the regular order of our agenda.

17 The first item on our agenda, item one, is the consideration
18 of our minutes from the last Board meeting. I just have one
19 small change. I've started a practice of adjourning the
20 meetings in memory of people, and think that that should
21 just be referred to in the minutes themselves. So I'd just
22 like to add that we adjourned the last regular Board meeting
23 in the memory of Caroline Rudman (phonetic).

24 And so with that addition, can I get a motion on
25 the minutes?

1 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Moved.

2 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Second.

3 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It's moved by Mr. Rossi,

4 seconded by Ms. Schenk.

5 Please call the roll.

6 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?

7 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

8 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?

9 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

10 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Hartnett? Mr. Rossi?

11 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

12 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

13 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

14 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Henning?

15 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.

16 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?

17 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.

18 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?

19 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.

20 MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Okay. I understand

22 people are leaving the room. If I could ask you to just try

23 to do that as quietly as possible so we can move on with the

24 business today. Okay. Thank you.

25 The next item on the agenda, item two, Mr.

1 Morales? Oh, I'm sorry. Why don't I go back to the agenda
2 as opposed to the minutes. You know, I get that wrong every
3 single time. Okay.

4 So next we're honored to have a presentation by
5 the Mayor of Palmdale, Mayor Ledford, about Palmdale's
6 planning efforts.

7 Mr. Mayor, thank you.

8 MAYOR LEDFORD: Thank you, Honorable Chairman and
9 Board. We appreciate you being in our community. As we
10 expressed earlier, we think it's -- this is an opportunity
11 for -- for everybody. There's a lot of complexity here, and
12 definition is really what we need. And the only way we get
13 definition is through this analysis. And we go into great
14 detail to analyze all the various options, and I think that
15 will help all of us get greater comfort in knowing, you
16 know, what is the correct answer. So I commend you for
17 this process. I think it's very, very important. And it --
18 quite frankly, I think we all win by this detailed
19 environmental analysis that we're about to go through for
20 the existing and even proposed alternatives, so thank you
21 for that.

22 I can tell you this, in my opinion, and I think in
23 the opinion of my colleagues and many of my residents, that
24 we recognize the future of the Antelope Valley becomes
25 amazing with high-speed rail. It's a game changer in many,

1 many ways. And so what we want to do is kind of underline
2 some of the reasons we think it's a game changer.

3 Antelope Valley has some of the longest commute
4 times in the United States, right here. And we have 70,000
5 people commute each day, many up to two hours each way, four
6 hours out of our day sitting in a car, trying to get home or
7 get to work. In -- or 2035 commute times are slated to take
8 up to four hours each way. That's unacceptable. And that
9 speaks to this project.

10 The growing population in the Antelope Valley,
11 currently we're about 500,000 population. By 2035 we're
12 going to be 1 million population. That four-hour commute,
13 that is not a game changer. That's going to really inhibit
14 our ability to facilitate those residents. We need help and
15 we know that transportation options and certainly high-speed
16 rail is part of the answer.

17 Now, why Palmdale and Antelope Valley? We believe
18 we're in the perfect location. We're centrally located.
19 And we already have some infrastructure. Our transportation
20 center, our Metrolink, High Desert Corridor all converge in
21 Palmdale. XpressWest, an airport where -- and as well as an
22 inland port possibilities, gives us options that are going
23 to help not only our Antelope Valley but the entire Southern
24 California region. We want to be a part of that.

25 We also know that there is tremendous opportunity

1 for economic development and job growth. We still have
2 double-digit unemployment here in the Antelope Valley.
3 We're one of the last areas to recover. Like the Central
4 Valley, we've been devastated economically. Our people need
5 to go to work. There's an opportunity with this project for
6 that to happen.

7 Also, we want to underscore that we're just not
8 showing up. We've been involved in this project for well
9 over 20 years. As a matter of fact, I remember going to the
10 very first High-Speed Rail Commission meeting. It was in
11 Downtown L.A. at the Ronald Reagan Building, and we showed
12 up, the City of Palmdale, we want in. We want to be a part.
13 Nobody knew where Palmdale was, but I think they know a
14 little more today. So 20 years it takes to -- really to
15 build that kind of critical mass.

16 And, of course, today we're working currently. We
17 have two grants that we're working with to evaluate how this
18 is going to fit into our community. We have one that uses
19 transportation concepts that we're analyzing, what's going
20 to come to our community? We want to be the center -- modal
21 center of the universe. We want it all. We want to plan
22 for it all. We think that is in our best interest long
23 term.

24 And also we have another grant that we're working
25 with that's going to generally -- the general area around

1 the station, land use, how do we accomplish this intermodal
2 mixed-use? What's it going to look like? What are all the
3 elements? And we want to engage again our residents,
4 primarily our school children, our future, the people that
5 are going to actually ride the system, they're the ones that
6 need to be engaged, and we actually have that process
7 underway. So we think that the future really speaks to how
8 we develop this as a community and the buy-in and the
9 opportunity, I think, will all come as we do our work.

10 Now, imagine -- let's all close our eyes -- we can
11 imagine 20 minutes from Palmdale to San Fernando Valley.
12 Unimaginable almost, but this project makes it imaginable.
13 Imagine 30 minutes from Palmdale to Downtown Los Angeles.
14 Ladies and Gentlemen, that is a paradigm shift for our
15 residents.

16 Right now if we spend four hours a day commuting
17 in a car, imagine 30 minutes to Downtown L.A. Now we become
18 little league coaches. We get involved in PTA. We actually
19 have a quality of life with our families when we get home,
20 as opposed to being burnt out and not looking forward to the
21 next do, doing the same thing again. Our quality of life
22 increases, a tremendous increase in our quality of life, and
23 we believe in many, many other ways that we've yet to even
24 measure.

25 What does this all mean? It means that our city

1 is a supporter of the California High-Speed Rail Authority's
2 decision to include a tunnel alignment from Palmdale to
3 Burbank in a separate EIR. Again, it allows us to break it
4 down, analyze it, get the good, the bad and the ugly so we
5 can make an informed decision on what is best. And we can
6 take all the comments you've heard today into consideration
7 as we try to move forward on what is our best alignment.
8 And only until we have that kind of information are we
9 really going to be informed enough to know and really
10 informed enough to make the correct decision.

11 I have confidence you're capable of doing that,
12 but you can only do it with -- with the type of information
13 that I believe everybody here has been calling for. Let's
14 analyze this thing to a point where we can make that kind of
15 call. This option does appear to be shorter, faster, less,
16 expensive, and less impacts, but I can only say that in a
17 general sense. We'll know more as we get more information.

18 Okay, finally, on behalf of the City of Palmdale
19 I'm here to submit, formally submit a Station Area Planning
20 Grant Application. This includes our city council
21 resolution, also our city's matching funds for this share of
22 the project. We think this is the next step for us as a
23 community. It's going to help us bring greater definition.
24 And it will help us develop what I call a reasonable
25 expectation. What's this project really going to mean to my

1 community? You only knew it -- know it through this type of
2 analysis, and these grants help us get there. So what I'm
3 here to do is to submit this grant application.

4 I want to say thank you to the Board. Thank you
5 for being in our community. We waited 20 years for you to
6 get here. Hope you enjoy your stay. And we look forward to
7 continually working toward the end goal, and that is to
8 build this system and transform the State of California.
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. I just want to -- I
11 want to thank the Mayor, the Members of the Palmdale City
12 Council, not only for their hospitality but for something
13 much more important than that, and that is for vision in
14 leadership. A lot of us who serve on this Authority look at
15 this project as more than just a train but as a tool that
16 communities can use to really shape their growth into the
17 21st Century. And we're very, very fortunate that we have
18 some visionary leaders in parts of this state here in
19 Palmdale, Mayor Swearengin in Fresno, in -- in Anaheim where
20 they have seized the opportunity of this new transportation
21 network to use it as a core for -- a tool for rebuilding
22 their city.

23 And I know, Mayor, you had a picture up on the
24 wall of the Master Transportation Plan. Mr. Morales and I
25 were down here meeting with you and your colleagues and your

1 staff. And the enthusiasm with which you approach the
2 planning function here in Palmdale, with high-speed rail
3 being a locus of -- of planning and development is something
4 that I think is vitally important as we go forward. And we
5 have a committee of this Board headed by Ms. Perez-Estolano,
6 and also with Mr. Frank, to look at transit land use
7 policies for this Board. And I know that they are both very
8 excited about the opportunities that cities like Palmdale
9 and others present to create a template for how intelligent
10 and sustainable growth can -- can occur around the stations.
11 It's very, very important to us.

12 So without commenting or presupposing the outcome
13 of your Planning Grant Application, let me just say that we
14 admire what you've been doing here in Palmdale. And it's a
15 privilege to be here, not only to visit your community but
16 also to -- to see the work that -- that you and your
17 colleagues are performing. So thank you.

18 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman, if
19 I could --

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Please, Mr. Morales.

21 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- maybe just
22 presuppose a little bit on the Grant Application. I'd say
23 we have been working very closely with the city on this. We
24 have funds reserved for this and, you know, expect to move
25 forward and execute this grant and continue the good work

1 with the city to ensure that as we develop our plans the
2 city can develop its plans, and that we work together to
3 achieve the sort of outcome that you've just spoken to.

4 So I just want to extend my thanks to the Mayor
5 and his team for their great work and pledge our cooperation
6 going forward.

7 MAYOR LEDFORD: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And it does give rise to -- I
9 know some of the others communities have not been as
10 receptive to the Planning Grant idea. And I certainly
11 think, Mr. Morales, that our Board ought to be considering
12 policies of how we deal with that because it's just too
13 important as we go forward to have haphazard development
14 around these statements. It would be a loss of opportunity
15 of immense measure. And so I think that's a topic of future
16 discussion.

17 Next we are going to have a report on the
18 XpressWest project. But I'd like to alert my colleagues
19 that right after that I'm going to skip to items seven,
20 eight and ten, which are action items for the Board so that
21 we can, as the hour gets late, we can make sure that that
22 business is accomplished, and then we can go on from there.

23 So item three, a status update. Mr. Mack, good to
24 see you again. Andrew Mack --

25 MR. MACK: Thank you.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- XpressWest.

2 MR. MACK: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Members of
3 the Board, Staff, thank you for the opportunity to come and
4 brief you on the XpressWest project. My name is Andrew
5 Mack. I am the Chief Operating Officer of the company.

6 Before I get into specific details on the project
7 itself I thought it would be good just to start with a base
8 understanding of what the real need is here in this
9 corridor, which I think is a good starting point for any
10 successful public infrastructure project is to truly
11 understand the market that we're looking to address and to
12 understand the need that's represented in that market.

13 So between Southern California and Las Vegas
14 there's an average of 38 million people that visit Las Vegas
15 annually, and that's between 2005 and 2013. Of that
16 visitation, this is a real interesting statistic, 40 percent
17 of that visitation traveled either as residents of Southern
18 California or through Southern California, and of that 90
19 percent drove on the I-15. So we have a very unique
20 corridor. I think it's different than another high-speed
21 rail corridor that's been looked at in the United States
22 where a majority of our market are actual drivers. So we
23 have to be competitive with what the car offers, which is
24 flexibility, cost, travel time.

25 We've done extensive work doing our ridership

1 studies, first at the level where -- where you are in the
2 environmental planning, and then advanced into investment-
3 grade ridership studies. And they've all been consistent
4 and demonstrated very squarely that there is a real need in
5 this corridor and that there is a real market that a high-
6 speed train will address.

7 So how do we implement a project like this? We
8 took a slightly different tact than the State of California.

9 Our approach was to build an initial system to the City of
10 Victorville which puts us in very close proximity to the
11 population center of Southern California. For those of you
12 not familiar with this region or the traffic in -- in
13 Southern California, Victorville is really the collection
14 point of all the east-west freeways that serve Southern
15 California. They all intersect with the I-15 south of
16 Victorville. And every one of those drivers of that 90
17 percent of the visitation to Las Vegas that drive, every one
18 of them goes through Victorville and goes along the I-15
19 because it's the only route to Las Vegas.

20 Secondly, to use standard gauge, steel wheel on
21 rail, fully electric high-speed train technology. Our
22 environmental document looked at both diesel-electric and
23 fully-electric and we concluded from an environmental
24 perspective and from a life-cycle operating cost perspective
25 the fully-electric multiple-unit train sets are the right

1 choice for this project. They -- it was selected as the
2 preferred alternative. And the technology that we are --
3 that we'll select, we're working in coordination with the
4 Authority. We want to ensure that what we select is --
5 provides for future interoperability.

6 Next, to implement this project through a private
7 interstate rail corporation, which are few words but become
8 a quite complicated matter. And I'll describe in the next
9 couple of slides how we were able to achieve that.

10 Lastly, and this is really looking at the broad
11 picture and the transportation network in -- in Southern
12 California and the high desert, we recognize an extension
13 over the High Desert Corridor, which has been a planned
14 freeway corridor over the last 20 years and has recently
15 been expanded to include high-speed rail, that an extension
16 over that 50 mile corridor between Victorville and Palmdale
17 provides an incredible opportunity to connect with the high-
18 speed rail system in Palmdale, with the existing Metrolink
19 system that comes up to Palmdale and serves Los Angeles,
20 Orange -- and Orange County.

21 So what is the project? It's approximately 185
22 miles between Southern California and Las Vegas. Our system
23 does run primarily within our adjacent to the I-15 freeway.
24 So we're inside the I-15 right-of-way for a majority of the
25 alignment. And I think a lot of what we've experienced in

1 getting through our record of decision and having both
2 Departments of Transportation in Nevada and California and
3 FHWA in Nevada and California sign off on a design manual
4 that shows how high-speed rail can be -- can be incorporated
5 into an existing freeway facility can be of great use to
6 you. It's proven to be a great use to the High Desert
7 Corridor folks as they've been going through their
8 environmental review process.

9 We're building the system on exclusive all new
10 track. There will be no at-grade crossings, similar to your
11 system. Passenger only service with an end-to-end travel
12 time of 80 minutes, and that's traveling at an average
13 operating speed of -- or top operating speed of 160 miles an
14 hour. So although the trains are -- are similar technology
15 to yours and have the capacity to go faster, we found that
16 the 160 miles an hour is the right choice from a financial
17 and -- and travel time perspective.

18 We provide nonstop service every 20 minutes during
19 peak. And if you can imagine, our peak from Southern
20 California to Las Vegas is about when the sun rises Friday
21 morning to when the sun rises Sunday morning. So it's a
22 very different kind of travel pattern than what you've seen
23 or that -- what a typical passenger rail system sees. And
24 so it lends itself to some interesting operating
25 characteristics. But again, being competitive with the

1 drivers, we need to provide that flexibility and that
2 operational capacity so that people can feel free to come
3 and go as they -- as they please.

4 Our average round-trip fare is under \$100. This
5 is what the basis of our financing is. And again, fully-
6 electric multiple-unit trains that would enable
7 interoperability with -- with your system and with future
8 systems in the state.

9 So how did we do this? As we stand today the
10 XpressWest is a fully-federally entitled private interstate
11 railroad. To our knowledge this is the first time in
12 American history that there has been a private passenger-
13 only interstate railroad approved for construction and
14 operation by the Surface Transportation Board. And what it
15 involved really was going through the process that you're
16 going through now, and environmental document that started
17 in 2006 with scoping meetings, and concluded in November of
18 2011, resulted in records of decision by the lead agency
19 which was the Federal Railroad Administration, cooperating
20 agencies, the BLM, Federal Highway Administration, both in
21 California and Nevada, the National Park Service was also a
22 cooperating agency, and both state DOTs participated, as
23 well.

24 In October of 2011 the STB issued its Certificate
25 of Public Convenience and Necessity. So that is the -- the

1 authorizing document that authorizes us as a private
2 interstate railroad. And then in December of 2011 we
3 executed a lease agreement with the BLM for all the federal
4 land that's required for the project, which is really the
5 majority of the -- of the property and it encompasses most
6 of the I-15 Freeway Corridor.

7 And then in September of 2012 the U.S. Army Corps
8 of Engineers issued its 404 Permit and our Clean Water
9 Certifications were issued. So again, as we sit today we
10 are fully entitled project.

11 What we learned in the environmental document is
12 that these projects do result in significant environmental
13 benefit. Again, the EMUs or zero-emission vehicles, the
14 project is estimated to reduce pollutants in the corridor by
15 40 percent over its life. The ridership forecast, and this
16 again is unique again for our project because there is such
17 a majority of travel demand that's by drivers, were
18 estimated to divert approximately 25 percent of the
19 automobiles off the freeway. And that results in pretty
20 significant greenhouse gas emissions reduction, as well
21 reduction in the use of oil, nearly 8.5 million gallons of
22 gas annually.

23 So how does this tie into a broader regional
24 context? And you know, we look at the Southwest Rail
25 Network as a significant network where there's a significant

1 need. We hear a lot when we're back east or on the news
2 about the Northeast Corridor and high-speed rail in the
3 Northeast Corridor and how important it is. And we just
4 draw that little comparison between the Southwest Network
5 and the Northeast Corridor, nearly the same length,
6 significant cities with significant population. There's 25
7 million people here in Southern California and they deserve
8 as good a rail as anywhere else in the country, and they've
9 shown their desire to ride it. The Pacific Surfliner is the
10 second most heavily ridden line in the country. So we just
11 need to provide them with a competitive product.

12 And I think there is a public policy context at
13 the local level for a connected interoperable system as
14 demonstrated by these actions taken by local agencies here.
15 The High Desert Corridor Joint Powers Authority which is
16 responsible for the connection between Victorville and
17 Palmdale, which I'll try to point out here is this line
18 here, this 50 miles between Victorville and Palmdale which I
19 had mentioned earlier was originally initiated as a freeway
20 corridor. In March of 2012 high-speed rail was introduced
21 into that corridor to connect Victorville with Palmdale.

22 L.A. Metro, San Bernardino Association of
23 Governments both followed suit and supported high-speed rail
24 in that corridor and expanded the environmental process to
25 include analyzing, as an alternative, high-speed rail within

1 that corridor. And then in April the Southern California
2 Association of Governments named and included XpressWest
3 from Palmdale through Victorville as a Strategic Plan
4 project and part of its vision for high-speed rail. And
5 then in July 2012 L.A. Metro unanimously adopted a
6 resolution supporting the project, as well, and it's
7 connectivity over the High Desert Corridor. So I think at
8 the local level there's a public policy framework that
9 supports this connectivity and interoperability.

10 And that's also followed at the federal level by
11 the Federal Railroad Administration who has purview over the
12 planning and development of these projects, they've recently
13 released the draft Southwest Multi-State Rail Planning
14 Study. And that study squarely focuses on the High Desert
15 Corridor and the connectivity and interoperability of the
16 California high-speed rail system and the XpressWest system.
17 Interestingly, it identifies top performing corridors in a
18 network, and these are corridors that show both independent
19 utility, as well as ability to enhance other systems. And
20 there were only three core -- expressed corridors that were
21 identified to meet those criteria, your system, north-south,
22 our system, Las Vegas to L.A., and then L.A. to Phoenix.

23 So in that system it also -- or in that study it
24 also recognizes the significant exponential benefit of
25 connecting California high-speed rail with XpressWest and

1 delivering a true Southwest Rail Network.

2 And I'd just like to say, again commend the City
3 of Palmdale for its efforts and being a supporter of high-
4 speed rail, and -- and to -- and for your input and for your
5 cooperation. I'd like to thank the Authority staff, as
6 well, for keeping us informed and updated of your progress.

7 And I'd like to express our commitment to continue our
8 cooperation with you and -- and to see if we can make these
9 systems come together.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Mack.
11 I appreciate it.

12 Let me ask my colleagues, any questions for Mr.
13 Mack about the XpressWest --

14 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I just have a quick
15 question, if you don't mind. You mentioned the lifespan of
16 the project, that it would have a certain amount of
17 greenhouse reductions over the lifespan of the project but
18 you didn't say or indicate what the lifespan was, so I'm
19 just curious.

20 MR. MACK: Well, the -- the study horizon period
21 for the EIS, I think was 40 years. So that's the period
22 that is studies for the purposes of -- of evaluation. You
23 know, the project lifecycle is in perpetuity. And you know,
24 we'd be rehabbing trains and refurbishing our -- our
25 physical assets to continue to run the system. But the

1 horizon of the environmental document only looks at a finite
2 period because it's so hard to go out any further beyond
3 that.

4 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: That's fine.

5 That's -- that's what I just wanted to know. Thanks.

6 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I'm just trying to understand
7 your model. Yeah. I'm looking at 185 miles, 20 miles on
8 average per gallon, how many gallons would a one-way trip,
9 18 gallons or \$90.00 round trip. If you figure out an
10 average, looking at the statistics, you're looking at three
11 people per car for that ride, I don't know how it's
12 competitive.

13 MR. MACK: Well, it's a much more complicated
14 question to answer than I can do in this time.

15 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Well, I don't -- I don't ask
16 simple questions.

17 MR. MACK: But --

18 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: But -- but the -- but the
19 math is fairly simple. So as a Board Member talking about
20 this configuration, I'm going to want to understand those
21 numbers.

22 MR. MACK: Completely understand. And -- and, in
23 fact, I think, you know, we can work with you so that you
24 can get a very full understanding of -- of how we arrived at
25 that. And it's -- and our -- our ridership studies are very

1 extensive, I mean, multi-year very expensive process that
2 included original surveys, modeling and all of that. So --
3 and they've been validated through extensive review by the
4 FRA. And so, you know, I'd be happy to help walk you
5 through how we arrived at -- at those conclusions.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Mr. Morales?

7 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Just -- I want
8 to reinforce an early point that -- that Andrew made, and he
9 didn't translate some of the numbers but I know he's used
10 them before. He talked about the trips out of the L.A.
11 Basin to Las Vegas. And if I remember right that's roughly
12 18 million trips a year out of the L.A. Basin --

13 MR. MACK: Yeah.

14 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- 15 million by
15 car.

16 MR. MACK: Yeah. It's -- it's about 19 and 17 --

17 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Okay.

18 MR. MACK: -- and it's forecasted to grow. The
19 market size is forecasted to grow to about 26 million --

20 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Right.

21 MR. MACK: -- by 2020.

22 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: And so I think
23 when you look at --

24 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: It's actually 13.5 if you use
25 his numbers, okay?

1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Part of the
2 issue, and I think to Mr. Rossi's question is, you know, the
3 theoretical travel time of driving at speed limit and -- and
4 other things like that when, you know, as Mayor Ledford
5 talked about, you know, the trip from here down can be an
6 hour or it can two or three, and certainly the same on the
7 15 heading to -- to Vegas. That travel time can be huge on
8 the weekends in particular. So part of the attraction
9 certainly is the -- is the reduced travel time. And, you
10 know, of course, the significant improvements in air quality
11 and other things that would result in that ridership.

1 and hop on a train and then, you know, in less than an hour-
2 and-a-half I'm -- I'm in Las Vegas?

3 So you know, that was a lot of the calculus that
4 went into the decision tree that resulted in our ridership.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Let me -- let me just say, one
6 of the things that I'm really proud of with this Board is
7 that Mr. Rossi spent many, many, many hours working
8 with our staff on the ridership models, and I think in so
9 doing brought a lot of credibility to the ridership analysis
10 that was done here and the associated revenues and -- and
11 questions of excess revenues over cost.

12 I think if you're willing, and I'm sure that you
13 are, if -- if your team, and if he's willing, could spend
14 some time with him to go through the analysis that you guys
15 have done it would be very helpful to us.

16 MR. MACK: Sure.

17 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And we certainly intuitively
18 see the -- see the value of the connection. Mr. Rossi is
19 usually not satisfied with intuitive assessments of things,
20 so --

21 MR. MACK: I've never known a banker to be --

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah.

23 MR. MACK: -- satisfied with intuition.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It's --

25 MR. MACK: So we're -- we're happy to do that.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, I think that would be
2 great. And -- and, actually, I think everybody would
3 benefit from -- from that. So --

4 MR. MACK: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Anyway, thank you very much --

6 MR. MACK: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- for taking time --

8 MR. MACK: Appreciate it.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- to come here today. And --
10 and I think the other thing we'd say is good luck as you
11 move forward.

12 MR. MACK: Thank you. You as well.

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. All right. We will
14 now move to item seven.

15 Mr. Morales, do you want to introduce this or just
16 have --

17 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Sure. As -- as
18 Michelle comes up to start we'll try to move -- this follows
19 on actions taken in April and June by the Board, looking at
20 the treatment of the combination of Burbank -- of Palmdale
21 to Burbank, and then Burbank to Los Angeles and down to
22 Anaheim. So what we are proposing for your consideration is
23 taking the next step in that series of how we look at these
24 segments and advance them through the environmental
25 processes.

1 MS. BOEHM: Thank you, Members of the Board.
2 Michelle Boehm, Southern California Regional Director.
3 We -- you have before you an action item. You do have the
4 Board memo with the details, so I will just highlight them.

5 As Jeff indicated, this is a follow on of previous
6 activities. We do have existing RC contracts that expire
7 for the Los Angeles to Anaheim section. It expires in March
8 of 2015. And we have an existing RC contract for the
9 Palmdale to Los Angeles section which expires in June 30,
10 2015.

11 As we presented to you at the June Board and as we
12 will discuss in our information item, we are now looking at
13 the Palmdale to Los Angeles section as Palmdale to Burbank
14 for an EIR/EIS process, and Burbank to Los Angeles Union
15 Station.

16 Therefore, we are asking for your permission to
17 release the RFQ to replace these regional consultants. And
18 we would like to combine Burbank to Los Angeles Union
19 Station and Los Angeles Union Station to Anaheim into a
20 single regional consultant contract, primarily in order to
21 deal with all of the complexities at the Los Angeles Union
22 Station location, which are myriad.

23 There are many ongoing projects at the particular
24 location, including the Los Angeles Union Station Master
25 Plan, the SCRIP project which is one of our early action

1 projects and a fantastic project for all of Southern
2 California, and the Los Angeles River Revitalization.
3 Because of all of those ongoing projects we would like to
4 have a single consultant team working on both the approach
5 into Union Station, as well as the approaches out, in order
6 to be more effective and efficient as we move forward and
7 coordinate with all of the agencies.

8 So we are requesting permission to release that
9 RFQ. That RFQ will include a 30 percent small business goal
10 per the standards set by the Board in 2012. Thank you very
11 much.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you, Ms. Boehm. Just for
13 the public at large, just to define some terms, an RC
14 contract is a Regional Consulting Contract, that's the
15 contract that helps us do the analysis of the routes through
16 particular regions. And the SCRIP project Ms. Boehm
17 referred to is basically the interconnecting track project
18 that would interconnect tracks from north and south of L.A.
19 Union Station.

20 Questions from Members of the Board for Ms. Boehm?

21 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I have a question.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Perez-Estolano.

23 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Hi Michelle. I
24 have -- in many of our -- and we, in our meetings in
25 Sacramento -- excuse me -- we have a number of small

1 businesses and representatives from different groups that
2 say that sometimes the larger contracts are more difficult
3 to participate with the prime if they're a sub. And they
4 would prefer, frankly, smaller contracts that are more bite
5 sized that they can then -- because, you know, if it's a
6 scale issue and they have to go from a million-dollar
7 contract to a three to five they may not be able to be
8 competitive. And that small business, whether it's woman-
9 owned, disadvantaged, veteran, minority, all of it, I have
10 heard many, many, many, many times that they feel that these
11 large contracts are difficult for them to be competitive in.

12 So knowing that and hearing that from before, what
13 are the steps we're going to do to address these issues?
14 Because this combination -- I understand efficiency is what
15 you're trying to do. But I need to make sure that we're
16 kind of out with how are we going to make it easier for the
17 small businesses to participate in a larger contract?

18 MS. BOEHM: Excellent. So --

19 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Let me respond
20 first on kind of the broader question.

21 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Sure.

22 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: I think that, as
23 Michelle pointed out -- sorry. As Michelle pointed out
24 the -- the 30 percent goal applies to this. So there will
25 be significant small business participation on this. That

1 is a criterion that we use in evaluating the proposals. And
2 they would have to show that they can meet that goal in
3 order to be given the contract.

4 We put together sessions, meet the primes, things
5 to try to connect small businesses with the -- with the
6 prime contractors. In terms of sizing the contracts so that
7 a small business could prime it, we looked for those
8 opportunities. We've been able to do that on one of the
9 items coming up on the right-of-way contracts, for instance.
10 Of the eight firms, I believe six are small businesses.
11 That's been the case on previous right-of-way contracts.

12 One of the regional consultant contracts for the
13 Sacramento to Merced was small enough that that -- we were
14 able to do that. And that is being led by a small business.

15 In a case like this the scope of the project and
16 the -- and the work needed is -- can't be bifurcated really
17 because we have to look at the -- the segment as a whole.
18 So there has to be the capacity to -- to bring those
19 services to the -- to the table. Conceivably you could have
20 several small businesses joint venture together to meet it.
21 We don't exclude that from happening, and that could
22 be an outcome. But we do certainly, where possible, where
23 feasible, to break the contracts into sizes that are
24 suitable for small businesses and where it's -- it's in the
25 best interest of the state, as well as the contractors, to

1 do that.

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Any other questions? A motion
3 from the --

4 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: So moved.

5 (Colloquy Between Board Members)

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry. I didn't want to
7 cut off comment. Any other questions for Michelle Boehm?
8 Okay.

9 I've got a motion.

10 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Second.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. I'm sorry, who moved it?

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I just saw Pat move it, so I
13 seconded.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, okay.

15 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Move.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Right. Right. Mr. Henning
17 moved it. Seconded by Mr. Rossi.

18 Would the secretary please call the roll?

19 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?

20 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

21 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?

22 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

23 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?

24 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Yes.

25 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

1 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

2 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?

3 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.

4 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?

5 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.

6 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?

7 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.

8 MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Thank you, Ms. Boehm.

10 Ms. Boehm, we're building an electric train, not a diesel.

11 I want to make sure you're clear on that.

12 MS. BOEHM: Thank you.

13 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman,

14 this next item, which -- which Tom Fellenz will speak to,

15 follows on action that the Board took in August. And this

16 is an administrative step to -- that is required to look at

17 Williamson Act, the parcels. I just want to make sure it's

18 clear to the Board that the -- the identification of these

19 parcels be -- the assessment of impacts and the development

20 of mitigation was all handled through the EIR/EIS process,

21 through the environmental process. This is a separate

22 administrative step that is required. These are not new

23 impacts. They're not new parcels identified. It's

24 really -- well, it's an administrative step but it is not

25 newly -- no new parcels are involved in any of these.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. I think that the key
2 point that was raised by Ms. Andranigian in her comments as
3 to whether or not this was -- having this item here was
4 disadvantageous to people in the Central Valley that might
5 be concerned. I appreciate Mr. Morales's comments.

6 Mr. Fellenz, you want to expand on that at all?

7 MR. FELLENZ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and
8 Board Members. As Jeff said, it's just a similar item that
9 was brought to you in August. And there is a Government
10 Code section that requires two findings by this Board before
11 we move ahead with the acquisition of these parcels that are
12 now under the Williamson Act. Those findings are listed in
13 the -- in the memo, those being that the land is not being
14 selected because of its lower property value that's burdened
15 by the Williamson Act. And then secondly, that there's no
16 reasonably feasible alternative for the improvement, which
17 is the project itself.

18 And so we also have attached a map showing the
19 location of all the parcels, as well as a table listing the
20 71 parcels that -- or, yeah, 71 parcels that we're asking
21 you to apply by this -- by this resolution.

22 And then finally, there is a resolution attached.
23 It's very duplicative of what you saw before in August.

24 Let me just comment that these parcels are
25 all located in Fresno County, whereas the action item that

1 you had voted on in August was all in Merced County --

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. And then just --

3 MR. FELLENZ: -- Madera County. Sorry. Sorry.

4 And --

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Fellenz. And
6 then just to reiterate one last time, this map and the
7 depiction of parcels here, there's nothing new about these
8 parcels? No new parcels are being selected? These were all
9 identified in the environmental documents previously?

10 MR. FELLENZ: That is correct.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. So any questions?

12 Mr. Frank.

13 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Question and a comment.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah.

15 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Tom, on Exhibit 1 you show a
16 number of these parcels where the effect, as I understand
17 it, of the proposed resolution would be to make the findings
18 with respect to a portion of these Williamson Act encumbered
19 parcels. Would the Williamson Act provisions remain
20 applicable to the portions of -- the remaining portions of
21 those -- each of those parcels that's been denominated in
22 green?

23 MR. FELLENZ: Yes.

24 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Okay. And then the other
25 thing that I think is important to note is that, as I

1 understand it, the -- the Authority has made an affirmative
2 commitment to go out and pursue on at least a one-to-one
3 ratio obtaining conservation easements on offsetting
4 properties that would be affected so that in terms of the
5 overall goal of ag land preservation, which is the basis of
6 the Williamson Act, we're -- we're furthering that while
7 we're going forward with the project.

8 MR. FELLENZ: Yes, that's correct. And even --
9 there's a higher ratio of commitment through a settlement
10 that we -- that we made for the --

11 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Right.

12 MR. FELLENZ: -- for the Merced to Fresno
13 environmental document.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. Other questions? All
15 right. I'll take a motion.

16 MS. ANDRANIGIAN: Mr. Chair, I don't want to -- I
17 don't --

18 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Andranigian, I'm sorry.
19 You know the rules. We had two hours, three hours of public
20 comment.

21 MS. ANDRANIGIAN: The APN numbers don't match up
22 though.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Well, I'm sorry, but you can
24 communicate through the staff. But the public comment
25 period is closed.

1 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Mr. Chairman, with those
2 clarifications just made by Mr. Morales and -- and our
3 colleague Mr. Frank, I make a motion for approving.

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: So --

5 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: I second.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. It's been moved by Vice
7 Chair Richards and seconded by Board Member Frank.

8 Will the secretary please call the roll?

9 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?

10 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

11 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richards?

12 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

13 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?

14 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

15 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

16 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

17 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?

18 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.

19 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?

20 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Yes.

21 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?

22 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.

23 MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Fellenz.

25 Item ten, considering the award of contracts for

1 right-of-way support services.

2 MR. FELLENZ: Yes. I'll make that presentation as
3 well --

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right.

5 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: -- Mr. Chairman.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Fellenz.

7 MR. FELLENZ: Yes. This is to consider awarding
8 right-of-way contracts for an aggregate amount of \$35
9 million. And this, again, was following this Board's
10 approval of a RFP that went out. You approved it in June of
11 2014. We -- we went through the procurement process. And
12 as your Board memo shows there were six teams that
13 qualified. But in the last day or two we've analyzed the
14 other two remaining proposals. And so I'd just like to tell
15 the Board that Staff is recommending that we award to all
16 eight teams. There were eight competitors, and we'd like to
17 award to all eight. This increases -- they're all capable
18 companies. This increases our resources that we would have
19 to do this right-of-way work.

20 And so the two teams that we'd like to add that we
21 don't have listed here, I'll just briefly read a paragraph
22 each about these -- these firms.

23 One is -- the Briggs Field Services, Inc. is a
24 right-of-way acquisition and support service company
25 providing complete range of services to the private and

1 public sector. They extend nationwide to transportation
2 industries consisting of pipeline companies, gas and
3 electric utility companies, communication companies,
4 railroad companies, federal, state and local agencies. They
5 are a certified DBE with headquarters in Houston, Texas.

6 The second team that we'd like to add would be the
7 Steel Land Services Company. It's a land and right-of-way
8 service company providing a wide range of comprehensive
9 acquisition and permitting services for over 45 years to
10 private industry and public entities. They have regional
11 and project offices throughout the United States, including
12 Santa Barbara, California. And I'd like to also point out
13 that six of the eight firms that we're recommending for
14 approval to be covered under this -- this resolution are
15 small business firms. And -- and our small business 30
16 percent goal will apply to all these contracts.

17 We're asking and recommending that the Board
18 approve the multiple contracts to be awarded for these eight
19 teams for a total aggregate amount for all eight teams of
20 \$35 million for a term of four years. And then Staff will
21 decide, based on need and performance by these teams, how
22 that work will be divided up. We think this is a very good
23 approach to take for working on the environmental -- I mean
24 the right-of-way process that's so important to move
25 through.

1 So also, if the Board chooses to pass this
2 resolution I would like a couple of changes to be made.
3 First of all, I'd like to add the two firms that I
4 mentioned, the Briggs Field Services, Inc. And the Steel
5 Land Services.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right.

7 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Just -- just two
8 things quickly to add, Mr. Chairman.

9 One, I want to make sure the Board understands it
10 is our intent with this that this -- the addition of these
11 firms would then cover our right-of-way professional
12 services for the entire Central Valley. So we would not be
13 coming back to the Board for further augmentation of these
14 contracts.

15 Secondly, we've made what I think are important
16 changes in the -- in the contracts to make them more
17 performance based. Previous right-of-way contracts were
18 done on a time and materials basis, meaning however much
19 time they spent they would -- they -- these are tied to
20 specific deliverables. And so there's stronger incentive on
21 the firms to get work done more promptly to help us reach a
22 conclusion on these -- on the items that they are charged
23 with in order to -- to get the right-of-way process
24 concluded more quickly.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I want to get the right-of-way

1 process concluded more quickly. And it's one of the gating
2 items for the project. My one concern would be as we add
3 capability here with the broader number of firms, about
4 maintaining consistency of messaging to -- across to the --
5 to the affected public and property owners. We hear people
6 make claims about what our right-of-way agents are saying.
7 I'm not saying that I necessarily take those at face value,
8 but I don't want to ignore them either. I just want to make
9 sure that as we do this that Staff is staying on top of
10 this, maybe through some type of feedback mechanism or
11 something to -- to just make sure that we're not getting
12 uneven results.

13 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman,
14 I'll just respond to that quickly. I agree completely. And
15 I was just down in Fresno last week and met with a number of
16 property owners who are going through the process and heard
17 some of that -- that concern. One of the things we are
18 doing to address that is developing -- all of these firms,
19 every firm we've retained are licensed professionals. You
20 know, they -- they are supposed to know all the rules and
21 how to proceed, know the laws, the regulations. But we are
22 providing a specific focused training program for all of the
23 people involved to deal with issues like communication,
24 messaging, etcetera, so that everyone is hearing the same
25 thing, getting the same information, the same message.

1 Because we agree completely that that is -- that is a
2 critical element of this and so that's -- it's not
3 incorporated into the contract but it's something we're
4 doing on a Staff level to -- to provide to all of these
5 firms.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Good.

7 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Could I --

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Could we go to Ms. Schenk
9 first, and then Mr. Rossi?

10 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Oh, yeah, I'm sorry.

11 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you. Well, I echo
12 what you said, Mr. Chairman, in terms of concerns. And it
13 really ties into -- and I see our friends from Kings County
14 left -- but the remark that was made about the appraisers
15 and the way, you know, they interact with some of the
16 community members. And again, I, you know, I don't know if
17 there's truth or not in it. But I think that we ought to
18 maybe develop a hotline so that people can call in, leave
19 their name, they have to have -- you know, it can't be
20 anonymous, and their -- their complaint or their issue,
21 whether it's about appraisers or right-of-way agents, so
22 that it -- it does get looked at, at the highest levels.
23 Because sometimes it's just hard for Staff to -- with
24 everything else on the ground -- to deal with some of these
25 kinds of things.

1 So at least initially if we could have some
2 kind -- look at having some kind of a hotline for people to
3 call in if they're having issues. And I'm sure that we can
4 sift through pretty quickly whether there's a real -- a real
5 issue or not.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you.

7 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Rossi.

9 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yeah, thank you, Mr.
10 Chairman. I have a couple of points. But the first one is
11 that I think the concern about communication is important,
12 but secondarily so; right? The -- the most important thing
13 when we start adding people is that you actually get
14 consistent performance as to what the requirements are. The
15 communication piece is -- you certainly want to be on top of
16 that. But the more bodies you add to this game with
17 different managerial styles is going to result in a much
18 greater need and discipline to ensure that everyone gets the
19 appropriate -- that no one firm is too easy or too hard, you
20 know?

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: That's what I really meant --

22 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yeah. Right.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- with consistency across
24 there.

25 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Which is -- which is not

1 necessarily a communications' issue.

2 The second thing is just purely an edification
3 question for my own -- you know, I'm looking at these
4 scores, and they're weighted -- they're weighted
5 differently, obviously. The total point scores are weighted
6 differently. But is there a breakpoint where if some --
7 some score just is not acceptable? I mean, I'm -- I'm
8 trying to figure -- I mean, because we could rank these
9 things and they could all be lousy and I wouldn't know
10 whether or not that's the case.

11 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: We have the
12 ability to -- yes, we can in the process set a minimum score
13 that -- and this would be true of any procurement. You
14 know, we can always set a score that all need to meet.

15 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Well, I just we --

16 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- and then a
17 threshold and --

18 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I just said we should, Jeff,
19 from the perspective --

20 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Right.

21 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: -- at least from the Board's
22 perspective. I've got a series of number. I'm not
23 particularly happy in doing something with 700-plus unless I
24 know that that's really an okay number; right?

25 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Right.

1 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Or are you just difficult
2 scorers?

3 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Well, you know,
4 that --

5 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Or it could be that, as well.

6 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: That is frankly
7 part of -- that's always an issue in a procurement is --
8 and, you know, again, you talk about training. We have to
9 go through, you know, the teams who are evaluating these
10 need to -- we need to make sure people are scoring
11 consistently.

12 Part of the reason we go through the full process,
13 also, is things may be -- may be missed in a proposal, and
14 we can get those clarified through -- through questions with
15 the contractors, with the proposers.

16 Our bottom line is bringing these forward is we
17 are very comfortable based on the proposals, based on the --

18 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I'm sure you are.

19 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Well --

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I'm sure.

21 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- that they
22 were all qualified --

23 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yeah.

24 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- to perform
25 the work. If -- if we did not believe so and they had not

1 scored sufficiently we would not bring them forward.

2 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I'm glad you believe this,
3 but this is not the Catholic Church. What I need to know in
4 making a decision is what's the break? Are they -- and
5 obviously they're all above the break, if you had a break.

6 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Right.

7 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: If we're going to do these
8 kind of numerical exercise then there should be some
9 understanding of what is acceptable and what isn't, just for
10 clarifies sake. That's all.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: So I guess just picking up on
12 that before I turn to others, what would be most important
13 to me coming out of this discussion is that this effort
14 really has to be managed. I mean, we know it has to be
15 managed in order to maintain the pace at which we acquire
16 these properties. And we got a slow start, and I think
17 you've done a great job of trying to catch up. And, of
18 course, having resources is key to that. But -- and maybe
19 this is a Finance and Audit Committee inquiry, but to make
20 sure that we have an evaluation and feedback mechanism so
21 that we are assuring that there's consistency and that there
22 is performance, and that -- that if these organizations, if
23 any one of them or two of them are not performing up to the
24 standards that you want to set, that there's a process by
25 which that's remediated or some of that work is shifted onto

1 others who are.

2 Because I think what you're hearing is we like the
3 idea of throwing more bodies at this problem. It's quite
4 appropriate. We -- but throwing more bodies without
5 managing that effectively is -- is going to be
6 counterproductive. And I know you know that. You're a very
7 capable manager. But I just want to make sure there's a
8 feedback loop that comes back through the Board so that we
9 kind of understand how this is being evaluated and -- and
10 monitored going forward.

11 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: I take that, and
12 all the staff take that very much to heart and we will
13 certainly do that. I want to -- I do want to reinforce,
14 that is the way this is set up the -- the eight firms, we're
15 not dividing the -- the money equally among them. It will
16 be assigned to each of the firms based on a number of
17 different things, including clustering of properties,
18 other -- other types of things. And performance absolutely
19 will be taken into account. And that was made clear in the
20 RFP process that you will not continue to get work if you're
21 not performing.

22 And so, you know, we're -- we believe each of the
23 proposers understood that and -- and, you know, will respond
24 accordingly. But we will manage it that way and certainly
25 will work to look at ways to best report that back to the

1 Board --

2 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Great.

3 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- on their
4 performance.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Other comments or questions
6 from other Members of the Board on this item?

7 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I have some
8 questions. I think I agree with my colleague Mike Rossi
9 that it's not here. And so you may have, you know, you may
10 have your evaluation. But if I -- if there's numbers here
11 and I'm not understanding exactly kind of what their rating
12 is, it's hard for me to say, oh, that's really a good score
13 that they came in and that's why they came -- they were --
14 they were allowed to proceed. But there's -- all that stuff
15 you just said is not in the document. It doesn't tell us
16 like if they -- if they failed to meet performance measures
17 this is what will happen. There's no communication back to
18 the Board in terms of how those things take place.

19 And so, you know, this is not a small contract and
20 authorization. Well, the -- it's not a small authorization.
21 And -- and I understand it won't be just given to one of the
22 six firms. I mean, it's going to be distributed
23 differently. It's just that there's no communication back
24 to how -- when it's going to come back. There's just no --
25 no loop back to us in terms of the feedback.

1 So, Tom, that's the only concern I have with this
2 is that there's -- there's no mechanism for even reporting
3 back how the right-of-way activity is going.

4 MR. FELLENZ: Okay. Well, we can make a
5 commitment. The staff can commit to come back to the Board
6 and periodically report to you on the performance of these
7 particular contracts and the right-of-way process itself.

8 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Mr. Chairman,
9 might I suggest that Board might consider adding to the
10 resolution some form of requirement from us to report back
11 on the performance.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Right.

13 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Is the Board comfortable with
15 quarterly reports on this or do they need to be more often
16 than that?

17 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Quarterly should
18 be fine.

19 MR. FELLENZ: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. So we'll add to the
21 resolution that Staff will report quarterly back to the
22 Board, I think through Finance and Audit Committee and then
23 the full Board --

24 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Sure.

25 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- so that we can stay on top

1 of this issue. And I think Staff knows that when the Board
2 asks these kinds of questions it's because we feel we need
3 to be satisfied about this. It's not an implicit sense of
4 lack of confidence, but it's just -- this is such an
5 important area.

6 MR. FELLENZ: Right. No. Understood.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: All right. With that
8 modification to the resolution could I entertain a motion.

9 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: I'll move.

10 MR. FELLENZ: And, Mr. Chairman --

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 MR. FELLENZ: -- could I just ask that the
13 modification include the naming of the two additional firms,
14 as well.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. I'm sorry. I thought --
16 okay. So with those two modifications, the naming of the
17 two additional firms and the reporting requirement, I
18 believe I heard it was moved by Ms. Perez-Estolano, seconded
19 by --

20 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Second.

21 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: -- Ms. Selby.

22 Would you please call the roll?

23 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Schenk?

24 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Yes.

25 MS. NEIBEL: Vice Chair Richard?

1 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Yes.

2 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Rossi?

3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Yes.

4 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Perez-Estolano?

5 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Yes.

6 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Henning?

7 BOARD MEMBER HENNING: Yes.

8 MS. NEIBEL: Mr. Frank?

9 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Abstain.

10 MS. NEIBEL: Ms. Selby?

11 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yes.

12 MS. NEIBEL: Chairman Richard?

13 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Fellenz.

14 Okay, so we'll now go to our two other information

15 items, item five, report on the scoping meetings for

16 Palmdale to Burbank. And Ms. Boehm is going to tell us --

17 I'm sorry?

18 BOARD MEMBER SCHENK: Item four.

19 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Item four? Did I skip item

20 four? How could I skip item four?

21 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Quickly, I hope.

22 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Status update on the Los

23 Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's

24 Regional Program.

25 MR. SEPULVEDA: It was a Freudian slip, I know.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: It was. I thought, Mr.
2 Sepulveda, you were just sitting here because these majestic
3 proceedings just captivated you.

4 MR. SEPULVEDA: I -- I am just engaged and I just
5 can't tell you how much fun this is.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Sepulveda, great to see
7 you.

8 MR. SEPULVEDA: Good afternoon, Mr. Chair and
9 other Board Members. I appreciate the opportunity to get up
10 and speak with you today about what we're doing in Los
11 Angeles. It's exciting times in Los Angeles. We've --
12 we've come a long way in the period of time that I've been
13 in this position. And -- and I'm proud to -- to show what
14 we're doing here.

15 So let's talk a little bit about regional rail.
16 Regional rail in Los Angeles County, basically my team deals
17 with everything that rolls with steel wheels in L.A. County
18 that Metro doesn't operate. And that's why we showed the
19 two -- the three different trains that we have on our banner
20 there. So what is regional? Well, let's talk a little bit
21 about what Los Angeles County is really quickly.

22 The center of that map there that you see which I
23 refer to as the pinwheel is Los Angeles Union Station. I
24 refer to Los Angeles Union Station as Rome; all rail lines
25 meet at Rome in -- in Southern California. So when we --

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: How does that relate to
2 Palmdale being the center of the universe?

3 MR. SEPULVEDA: Yeah. I'll hold on that one.

4 In that map you see the number of projects that
5 L.A. Metro is doing, and transit projects through our
6 Measure R program and other programs. The dashed lines are
7 projects that are underway or will be underway, and the
8 solid lines are completed.

9 And this is the regional network. We'd like to
10 call ourselves Regional Rail because we deal with the
11 Southern California region because of our connectivity
12 with -- with Southern California. We -- although we are
13 just L.A. County, we do own 190 miles of right-of-way in
14 L.A. County that commuter rail and freight rails operate
15 over. We develop capital projects for the county. And we
16 do -- we work with you folks, as well as Amtrak and
17 Metrolink. And we are a 50 percent -- 53 percent member
18 agency of Metrolink and manage that budget and that
19 involvement.

20 The map is important to note. And the blue dot
21 you see in the center is, again, Los Angeles Union Station.
22 The pink lines that you see are Metrolink lines, commuter
23 lines coming in and out of Los Angeles Union Station,
24 carrying people from San Diego, the Inland -- excuse me --
25 the Inland Empire, North Los Angeles County, and north of

1 Ventura into Los Angeles Union Station. And if I can point
2 out that the line that heads down, the Ventura line heads
3 actually from San Luis Obispo to San Diego is what they call
4 the LOSSAN Corridor. It's the second busiest intercity
5 passenger rail corridor in the country. So this is what
6 we're working with in Los Angeles County as we -- as we move
7 forward.

8 And the purple line you see, this is -- this is
9 pre-other alternative. But the purpose line you see is the
10 high-speed rail system. And right about that dot, this
11 confluence of these lines here, is right about where the
12 initial operating segment would terminate.

13 So what we have is a capital program that actually
14 is working on advancing projects that will increase the
15 capacity for the system, increase the safety of the system,
16 advance options to help our communities along the way
17 because our communities are affected by rail, just as the
18 passengers are affected by rail. And, of course, we are
19 facilitating the MOU that we have with you folks in
20 advancing projects. And we -- we are actually looking at
21 other means of funding that actually work towards -- towards
22 enhancing the rail system.

23 So this is a measles map (phonetic) of our
24 projects in Los Angeles County. And this is that we've been
25 moving forward here. You'll notice the four shaded projects

1 are actually MOU projects, and I'll get more into those in a
2 moment. But we've got a series of -- we've got a station --
3 two station projects -- three station projects, excuse me,
4 two double-track projects, two grade separation projects,
5 a -- I'm sorry, four station projects -- the SCRIP project
6 and -- and another environmental project that we're working
7 with. So our capital program, in a nutshell, is about \$842
8 million worth of construction value that we have moving
9 forward out of our team.

10 This was the original run-through tracks back in
11 1948. This actually did happen at Union Station. This --
12 this engineer, his foot slipped off the brake maybe. This
13 is before the 101 Freeway, of course. This is -- this is
14 what was. And what we have now is what we call the Southern
15 California Regional Interconnector Project. And this will
16 take at least four tracks across the 101 Freeway, and I'll
17 show a map in a moment. It will reduce our -- our idling
18 time, locomotive idling time in Union Station. Right now
19 Union Station is a push-pull configuration. The trains push
20 in locomotive -- or excuse me, cab car first and they pull
21 out locomotive first. What that means is every train has 15
22 to 20 minutes of idling time while they change ends of the
23 train. What that accounts to is 40 to 50 hours of
24 cumulative diesel-electric idling time at Union Station.

25 What the SCRIP project will do is allow 50 percent

1 of those trains to run through the station, treating the
2 station as a dwell stop rather than a terminal, and actually
3 reduce our greenhouse gases by approximately 44 percent.
4 It's a big number for us when we start looking at the
5 thousands of pounds of -- of elements that we've got
6 involved here.

7 We have -- this project is actually underway right
8 now. We have provided an educational component on this
9 where we're actually going to be working with local
10 universities to -- civil engineering students to actually
11 have their partnership in the project as we move it forward.

12 So this is what the project is. Union Station,
13 you could see, is actually more of the gray. This is the
14 bird's eye view. What we'll do is we'll take tracks out the
15 south end of the station, split them, send them south into
16 Orange County or north up towards the northern L.A. County.
17 We will have the -- the ability to take trains and
18 essentially orbit the station when this is done. This
19 allows a lot more flexibility, operational flexibility for
20 the station. It increases the capacity of the station by
21 approximately 50 percent.

22 It's an exciting project. It's a game changer for
23 rail in Southern California. This is a project that is
24 supported by all counties in Southern California, including
25 San Diego. It actually benefits everybody up and down the

1 coast of California on the LOSSAN Corridor, so it's pretty
2 important to us. And from a high-speed rail standpoint what
3 it does it is allows us to better serve the IOS, and it
4 allows us to better bring people into Union Station to serve
5 the future full build-out of high-speed rail.

6 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Don, just to
7 reinforce that, I believe this project emerged through the
8 interagency process as the number one regional priority for
9 investment --

10 MR. SEPULVEDA: Yes.

11 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- by all of the
12 Southern California counties.

13 MR. SEPULVEDA: Yes. This was unanimously
14 selected by all the Southern California agencies that are a
15 part of the MOU and others, as well, as the number one
16 project of -- of regional importance. This project was
17 actually designed in 2003 to 35 percent, but it did not have
18 the northern leg that you see there. It had just the dash
19 line. And it was environmental cleared in 2006. What we
20 have to do is update the environmental document and move it
21 forward into -- into full design. And that effort is
22 working through right now. We were --

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And if I could just ask a
24 question. Just as -- as high-speed rail ultimately is built
25 through there some of those will be our tracks, I would

1 presume?

2 MR. SEPULVEDA: We are looking at options right
3 now on that, Mr. Chair. Right now we are just showing in
4 this option the commuter lines. We're looking at modeling
5 and what will happen with the capacity of Union Station with
6 high-speed rail inside the -- the campus of Union Station
7 versus being immediately off campus.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Because then we'd need
9 electric -- electric systems, of course, to go with that as
10 we come in now.

11 MR. SEPULVEDA: We also need four dedicated
12 tracks, two dedicated platforms for high-speed rail because
13 of the difference in the vehicles. So --

14 VICE CHAIR RICHARDS: Is that -- is that just
15 currently a part of your study? Are you --

16 MR. SEPULVEDA: That -- that is. We are working
17 with the -- the High-Speed Rail Corridor Team on this.
18 They've come up with -- with a concept. And we are looking
19 at -- we're going to be looking at that concept once we see
20 a little bit more of a development of the throats of that
21 concept. Our folks are modeling Union Station for the
22 maximum capacity of the Union Station to see exactly what
23 the ramifications are of any alternative.

24 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: And this I think
25 reinforces the earlier comments Michelle made about why

1 we're -- we proposed Burbank to Anaheim as a segment,
2 because this is where it call connects.

3 MR. SEPULVEDA: Yes.

4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: So you have to
5 look at them all together.

6 MR. SEPULVEDA: Very good point.

7 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: And, Don, you said
8 two dedicated tracks and four --

9 MR. SEPULVEDA: I'm sorry. Two dedicated -- for
10 high-speed rail?

11 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Uh-huh.

12 MR. SEPULVEDA: Two -- it would -- it would have
13 to have two dedicated platforms --

14 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Okay. All right.

15 MR. SEPULVEDA: -- four dedicated tracks.

16 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Four tracks? Okay.
17 Thanks.

18 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: And is there any way not to
19 have dedicated platforms? Is there anywhere to share
20 platforms?

21 MR. SEPULVEDA: We'll have to look at that
22 further. I don't know the answer offhand if we can modify
23 it. But -- but right now the high-speed rail system has a
24 very set up system. What we have to think about is
25 passenger circulation, how the passengers are going to move

1 from -- from platform to platform, how they have to move
2 through the concourse and how that all works. So it --
3 there may be a logistical challenge with that that we have
4 to look at still.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And they'd have to electrify
6 the Metrolink and other things which will -- if say that it
7 will cause Mr. Sepulveda to break out in hives.

8 MR. SEPULVEDA: I'd love to be able to do it.
9 Okay, let's -- any further questions on --

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: No, that's good.

11 MR. SEPULVEDA: Okay, then moving on, part of the
12 regional network in California is not just the -- the line
13 down the -- right around SCRIP, but what we've got -- are
14 doing is actually connecting up to our airports, as well.
15 We have an existing airport station on the Ventura line with
16 Metrolink and Amtrak serving the airport. For the longest
17 time that was the only inner-city connection and commuter
18 rail connection to an airport in the country. And it's been
19 since changed. We now have others, but this was the
20 forerunner for it.

21 They have recently completed a Regional Intermodal
22 Transportation Center there. What we are going to do is
23 we're going to build a pedestrian bridge between the station
24 and that Regional Intermodal Transportation Center. That's
25 something about what it's going to look like. What this

1 will allow us to do is close two at-grade pedestrian
2 crossings and provide a solid connection between the train
3 station and the airport terminal, increasing our plane-to-
4 train connection goal that we are trying to do as an agency.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: And again, is that being
6 designed -- I mean, I think it's -- one of our proposed
7 alignments is to have high-speed rail connect to the Bob
8 Hope Airport in Burbank. So is your design work taking into
9 account that possibility?

10 MR. SEPULVEDA: This is at the other station.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: This is the other station?

12 MR. SEPULVEDA: This is at the south end of the
13 airport. We're connecting with high-speed rail at the north
14 end of the airport.

15 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Got it.

16 MR. SEPULVEDA: And the answer to your question
17 is, yes.

18 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Could you pay attention, Mr.
19 Chairman?

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I was stuck on thinking about
21 Bart to SFO and that's not the airport. I can see
22 everybody's blood sugar is starting to plummet.

23 MR. SEPULVEDA: I was going to say, it looks like
24 it's lunchtime.

25 Now moving on, one of the things that we are

1 looking at is grade separations. Grade separations are
2 pretty important to us. And I'll get into why -- why
3 they're more important to us in L.A. County now more than
4 ever.

5 This is a particularly challenging intersection
6 right here. This is the intersection of Rosecrans,
7 Marquardt and the BNSF San Bernardino Subdivision. This is
8 where the high-speed rail route will take us as we go to
9 Anaheim. This -- this -- there was a grade separation
10 designed in 2003. This was environmentally cleared back in
11 2003. It was a three-track bridge. However, it's never
12 been built because of cost and -- just cost.

13 So what we've decided to do is move this project
14 forward. We have some Measure R funds that we are going to
15 use on this. And we've got, since it's on the High-Speed
16 Rail Corridor, some Prop 1A funds. What we have here,
17 though, is a ten-year old design that doesn't meet the
18 future needs of the corridor. So what we're doing is
19 scrapping that ten-year-old design and we're going out with
20 a new design that meets the -- the future needs of the
21 corridor.

22 The future needs, some of the proposed ideas have
23 been three passenger -- or excuse me, three freight tracks
24 and two passenger tracks. Our new design would allow for
25 that, so that's -- we're going out with an RFP for that

1 within the next two weeks to get a consultant onboard to
2 take that design through to its completion, then Metro will
3 lead the construction on that.

4 As I said, this was -- this is a project that's
5 funded with voter-approved Measure R funds in L.A. County.
6 This will allow us to build the triple -- the third track
7 across the intersection or about -- across the crossing. It
8 will allow us to increase service in through the Riverside
9 area and the Inland Empire, and also from South Orange
10 County and San Diego up into Union Station. This is a major
11 bottleneck for us in -- in regional rail in Southern
12 California.

13 This is the slide I was referring to.

14 Yes, sir?

15 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: It also has
16 significant implications for traffic in that area --

17 MR. SEPULVEDA: Yes, it does.

18 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- than the
19 (inaudible) --

20 MR. SEPULVEDA: This has actually been the --

21 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- car traffic,
22 that is.

23 MR. SEPULVEDA: This is the number one hazardous
24 crossing in the state. There have been numerous accidents
25 there, including fatalities. This is -- the state has their

1 Section 190 Grade Separation List; this is number one. So
2 that's the further impetus to get this one moving forward.

3 Grade crossings in Los Angeles have been on the
4 rise -- grade crossing incidents have been on the rise in
5 the last five years. It's a disturbing trend for us. And
6 we're looking at that rather seriously.

7 And so what we've decided to do is we're going
8 with -- and this will be by the end of October -- is our
9 L.A. County Grade Crossing and Corridor Safety Program
10 looking at our 111 at-grade crossings, developing a
11 prioritization system and a plan and a program to move them
12 forward to enhance those crossings and/or grade separate
13 those crossings, something that's a long time coming in Los
14 Angeles. It's pretty important to us.

15 We're also going to look at the corridors in
16 itself for how do we -- can increase the safety in the
17 corridors itself. So we've got a combination of 111
18 crossings over 190 miles of railroad corridor that we're
19 going to be looking at in this. It's a pretty serious
20 project for us and we're pretty excited about getting it
21 forward.

22 Brighton and Roxford double track, this RFP was
23 released yesterday. And that loop there, the south end of
24 the loop is that -- is the IOS terminal. This is the
25 section of the double track that's going to serve the --

1 directly serve high-speed rail IOS between Santa Clarita
2 and -- excuse me -- and the IOS. It's a single-track area
3 right now. We're moving forward with the double track which
4 means that we've got -- we'll be affecting three stations
5 along the way, so we've got to look at how we address those
6 stations. This one is moving forward rather quickly.

7 Our Doran grade -- Street grade separation is an
8 evolving project. This originally started off as just grade
9 separating Doran Street. The High-Speed Rail Corridor is
10 right along the rail, that rail right there, and it is
11 expected the high-speed rail will go along that corridor.
12 So Doran Street and Broadway/Brazil are within a half a mile
13 of each other, and they both need to be grade separated.

14 We started this by looking at Doran Street only as
15 a grade separation. We found out that the impacts to the
16 communities are just as severe if we put a grade separation
17 at Doran Street, as if we move the crossing down -- oh -- as
18 if we move the crossing down.

19 So the idea is to build a grade separation
20 somewhere in this area right here, build a connection to the
21 north, and be able to close to at-grade crossings for
22 basically -- it's about, basically, two crossings for the
23 price of one. If we don't do that, then we build a grade
24 separation that's intrusive here and another one that's
25 intrusive here, and this one would have the same impact as

1 if this one was built right here. So we need to do it now
2 and be more efficient with taxpayer dollars. So this is
3 what we're looking at. This is in the alternatives'
4 analysis stage. It's about to go into full environmental.

5 The double-track project, I spoke about this
6 corridor earlier. This is the Ventura Line. This is the
7 LOSSAN Corridor. This is the second busiest intercity
8 passenger rail corridor. We have 6.8 miles of single track
9 left in L.A. County in that corridor. It's a freight-used
10 corridor. We own it jointly with Union Pacific Railroad.
11 So what we're doing is we've got a state allocation to
12 actually go and build the double-track project. It's an \$88
13 million project that's in engineering right now.

14 Associated with that project is the Van Nuys
15 Station. Right now the Van Nuys Station is on two main
16 tracks, but there's only one platform that only serves one
17 track. What that means is we have almost nine miles of
18 single track in that territory. So what we're doing is
19 building a double-track platform in that area. That,
20 combined with that other project, will increase the capacity
21 in that corridor significantly and allow us to better serve
22 the IOS.

23 Vincent Grade Station, we're adding -- we're
24 lengthening the track -- or the siding and we're adding a
25 second platform. This will actually save some wait times

1 for commuter and freight by as much as 15 minutes. This is
2 the station that we were talking about at the -- this is at
3 the -- the north end of the airport. We're building a new
4 station with -- with -- working with Bob Hope Airport. And
5 kind of ignore the direction of that plane you see in the --
6 in the long drawing there. If we see a plane at that angle
7 at that station we've got a bigger problem than we think,
8 since the runway essentially perpendicular -- is
9 perpendicular to the railroad tracks there.

10 So this is the concept for the station. This
11 would be directly north of the initial operating segment
12 terminus. It will be a single-track station initially.
13 We'll be modifying it as we start moving forward. And we'll
14 have to work with High-Speed Rail as we start moving forward
15 to actually get that -- that station completely in sync with
16 the terminus, that they actually serve as one.

17 So what's in the future? We're continuing to
18 advance projects. We're -- we're moving forward with
19 projects that advance capacity, safety, and serve our
20 communities. One of the things that we talk about with
21 grade separations and grade crossings is the benefits they
22 have on our communities, and that's very important to us as
23 we start moving forward.

24 We also need to establish a programming need. We
25 need to advance projects so that they're more attractive for

1 funding. A funding process, as you have found, is that it's
2 sometimes the chicken or the egg syndrome. The more the
3 project is developed the better chance it has of funding,
4 but you can't get the funding because the project isn't
5 developed. So it's one of those things. So this is what we
6 are looking at in Los Angeles.

7 So with that, Mr. Chair, I've completed my
8 presentation.

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Don, thank you very much, and
10 thanks for hanging in there with us today. I think all of
11 us are both impressed with and appreciative of the -- the
12 work that you guys are doing down there.

13 And the last point I would simply make is just
14 that one of the hardest things for us to communicate to the
15 public is that it's not just about high-speed rail. It's
16 California, the state people think of as a car culture
17 state, is actually making a massive investment in a modern
18 rail system for the 21st Century within interconnections,
19 both interregionally and -- and intraregionally and so
20 forth. And you guys are really on the forefront of that,
21 and we're very pleased to be working with you.

22 MR. SEPULVEDA: Thank you.

23 Let me just ask my colleagues if you have
24 questions? Mr. Frank?

25 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: Not a question, just a

1 comment. I spent the first 18 years of my life growing up
2 in Southern California in Burbank, and at a time when there
3 was really no such thing as any kind of mass transit. I had
4 the opportunity with Board Member Schenk yesterday to go on
5 a tour of -- starting at Union Station and heading up here
6 to Palmdale of the right-of-way. But as part of that I got
7 a liberal education as to all of these exciting projects at
8 a number of these sites.

9 And people of my generation tend to say that, you
10 know, things aren't nearly as good as they used to be. When
11 it comes to transportation patterns and transportation
12 innovation I can honestly say that the area, the community
13 in which I grew up in Southern California is far better off
14 based on the projects you're undertaking and have completed
15 than -- than they were 40 or 50 years ago. So it's an
16 exciting, exciting present even more exciting future.

17 MR. SEPULVEDA: Thank you.

18 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: Well, can I add
19 something?

20 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yes.

21 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: You know, it's a
22 real pleasure working with Metro and in partnership with
23 Metro. And I think that that, between the High-Speed Rail
24 Board and the staff of High-Speed Rail, it's really, for me,
25 been a great working relationship. When things are hard and

1 difficult we sit down and talk about it. And when things
2 are going great we sit down and talk about it. And I think
3 that that's a good relationship that we need to continue to
4 grow upon and build upon.

5 MR. SEPULVEDA: I agree.

6 BOARD MEMBER PEREZ-ESTOLANO: So thanks.

7 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Other questions, comments?

8 Don, thank you very much.

9 MR. SEPULVEDA: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: We were impressed on that.

11 MR. SEPULVEDA: Have a great day.

12 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Thank you. Okay. Now we can
13 move to item five where Ms. Boehm is going to tell us if
14 there was any reaction to our plans to build high-speed rail
15 from Burbank to Palmdale.

16 And I might suggest, Ms. Boehm, that I think we
17 got a little bit of a flavor for that this morning, but
18 please fill us in.

19 MS. BOEHM: Yes. So today this is just an
20 information item. This is a report on the recent scoping
21 meetings. Due to the complexity and the amount of comments,
22 this is not an action item at this time.

23 So as we discussed at the June Board meeting, we
24 had the Los Angeles to Palmdale section. You can see that
25 there on the left-hand of the slide. The Palmdale

1 Transportation Center, of course where we're located here
2 it's just adjacent to where we are right now, it comes down
3 to a Burbank -- proposed Burbank Airport Station location
4 and goes into Los Angeles Union Station.

5 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Michelle, hold on one second.
6 I just wanted to see -- I'm sorry -- if the -- are you okay?

7 COURT REPORTER: Oh, perfect. Sorry.

8 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: No, no, it's okay. I just
9 wanted to know if you needed anything. So that was just for
10 the transcriber.

11 I'm sorry.

12 MS. BOEHM: Oh, no, no. That's okay.

13 So as we had discussed and as we discussed
14 previously in the action item, we are now taking a look at
15 this section, which was 60 miles, as two separate sections.

16 We have the Palmdale to Burbank section which is
17 approximately 45 miles, and the Burbank to Los Angeles Union
18 Station section which is approximately 15 miles. This was
19 what started the amendment to the scoping process and
20 resulted in the number of public meetings that we had
21 recently. And that's what we're going to recap, as you can
22 see there, the yellow area, the study corridor area that so
23 many folks today commented on.

24 And I just want to say that as we've gone through
25 this process we have had a substantial amount of

1 communication, both through the media and to the public on
2 what we are doing right now. We did release the Federal
3 Register and State Clearinghouse Notices at the end of July.
4 We advertised in a variety of newspapers and local
5 publications. We reached out to a variety of local
6 neighborhood council groups to communicate to them what we
7 are doing.

8 We also held seven public scoping meetings. And
9 we also held a federal regulatory agency scoping meeting, as
10 well. We had over 900 people attend these meetings. And
11 those numbers are still going up in terms of the total
12 number of comments. We are now over 900, the comment period
13 which was extended through Friday of last week, and so we
14 are still receiving those comments via mail.

15 Here is a brief map of the Palmdale to Burbank
16 project section. Again you can see here that it's a 45-mile
17 corridor. You can see the existing SR-14 alignments that we
18 have been studying. And again you can see the potential
19 study corridor area located there. You can see that we have
20 identified the outlines of several of the cities that are in
21 proximity. You've got Acton up there at the top, Aqua
22 Dulce, Santa Clarita, coming into Los Angeles, Burbank and
23 the Glendale area. So this was one of the maps that was
24 presented to the public during this activity. Burbank to
25 Los Angeles Union Station, 15 miles, you can see it here.

1 Again we highlighted the variety of communities
2 that this project will run through. This project then is
3 also in close proximity to the Los Angeles River in some
4 locations.

5 And we received a lot -- a plethora of feedback,
6 if you will, on these particular alignments and our
7 suggested approach to study a corridor. These here,
8 representative here are the agency and city feedback, or
9 just representative of the agency and city feedback that we
10 received. You can see most of the information here is
11 consistent with the comments that we received today, so I
12 will not go through it in detail. But people are very, very
13 concerned about environmental justice, as well as our
14 natural resources as we look at these projects.

15 With regards to the public, they're also very
16 concerned, certainly, about residential impacts to their
17 areas, the noise and vibration impacts, as well as, as
18 you've heard here very well-articulated, the uniqueness of
19 some of the equestrian communities that we are in proximity
20 to.

21 With regards to Burbank to Los Angeles, we did
22 receive from the agencies similar comments with regards to
23 respecting the natural resources, specifically the Los
24 Angeles River and water quality. We also received comments
25 about the connections at the L.A. Union Station location

1 which were driving some of the information that we're
2 working on here today with regards to the single contract.
3 Also some concerns about the initial operating section and
4 encouragement for high-speed rail to just keep moving and
5 not -- not stop for a period of time at Burbank.

6 Public feedback, again very similar concerns about
7 the river, concerns about traffic and, again, the visual
8 noise and vibration impacts.

9 So in terms of the next steps, we want to complete
10 a scoping report. We want to make sure that we have
11 collected all of the comments to date on this and put them
12 into a report. We will advance -- continue to advance our
13 connectivity and earlier-action projects with our partners
14 that Don Sepulveda talked about today. We will initiate our
15 station area planning activities, as the Mayor of Palmdale
16 talked about today. And then we will continue to identify
17 the constraints, basically, as we look for the alignment or
18 alignments that we will be studying through an environmental
19 process to determine the best possible project.

20 We will then -- throughout this period we will
21 make sure that we are conducting public workshops and that
22 the public is engaged throughout the process as we develop
23 the draft environmental document. Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Questions for Ms. Boehm?

25 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: I have a question.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Ms. Selby.

2 BOARD MEMBER SELBY: Yeah, I just -- I want to --
3 I'm pretty sure this is the case, but I see the pictures and
4 I see the people who are here today from -- from Acton, and
5 I'm thinking more about the Burbank section of it, too, to
6 the Union Station, but do you feel like you got a good
7 representation of the people who actually live there, in
8 particular people of color and, you know, people who might
9 have -- need some different languages? I know you reached
10 out in different languages. I just wondered if you could
11 touch on that.

12 MS. BOEHM: Yeah. Thank you. We did move up. So
13 every time we're going through a public comment process we
14 are actually adding meetings to make sure that we are
15 putting meetings where they are accessible for the public.
16 We are also going out to local elected offices to talk to
17 them about the community centers, the types of organizations
18 they have, where we can provide information so that we can
19 communicate with them. When we are holding our meetings we
20 typically have at least one language in translation at our
21 meetings, up to four or five languages in translation at our
22 meetings. And that is presented to provide that assistance
23 for folks. We also have hotlines that can be called where
24 people can get information in terms of having a translator
25 call them so that they can provide their feedback.

1 There's always more -- more that can be done,
2 more -- a broader goal to make sure that we are
3 communicating this project to the broad urban Los Angeles
4 area. We have many, many people here. But we are
5 definitely making positive steps.

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Frank?

7 BOARD MEMBER FRANK: You know, following up the
8 same theme, you know, the environmental justice issues are
9 very important, and especially so, it seems, in Southern
10 California. Has our staff worked at all with the
11 environmental justice experts at the Cal/EPA? Because
12 that's an organization that for a long time I think talked
13 about environmental justice but not too many tangible
14 accomplishments. And I think in the current administration
15 that is very much dramatically changed, and I've been very
16 impressed with the people at Cal/EPA who are working and
17 focusing on environmental justice issues.

18 I just mention that as an additional resource that
19 we may choose to draw upon as we go forward and spend an
20 appropriate amount of time and attention and concern about
21 those environmental justice issues.

22 MS. BOEHM: Thank you for that suggestion.

23 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Okay. With that, did you want
24 to go into your next presentation?

25 MS. BOEHM: Certainly. All right. Item number

1 six is a general update on the Southern California sections,
2 following up from the update that was presented to the Board
3 in October of 2013.

4 Here is a representational, not -- not a detailed
5 map but a representational map, essentially, of the Southern
6 California sections traveling from the outskirts of
7 Bakersfield all the way down to San Diego. So you can see
8 we have substantial ground to cover, as well as numerous
9 types of community issues, natural resource issues. We sit
10 on top of basically 22 to 25 million people in the State of
11 California in a state of 38 million people. And so we have
12 substantial challenges as we move the project forward, but
13 we also have wonderful partners as we move the project
14 forward.

15 And essentially the program down here is a two-
16 fold program, and some of this was touched on earlier by Don
17 Sepulveda. But essentially the first prong of this is that
18 we are bringing forward early investments through
19 partnerships to deliver regional mobility projects like the
20 State College/Doran Street and Rosecrans/Marquardt grade
21 separations, and the Southern California Regional
22 Interconnector project that will improve the LOSSAN Corridor
23 service for Metrolink, Amtrak. Importantly, and we don't
24 always talk about that, but that improvement to the
25 passenger rail system will directly improve our freight

1 movement system, as well. So we get direct goods' movement
2 benefit, as well, when we're looking at these improvements.

3 Combined with the financial contributions that the
4 authority has made to the positive train control, Metrolink
5 tier-four locomotive purchase, this full suite of projects
6 will materially, as I mentioned, improve passenger and
7 freight rail and reduce greenhouse gas emissions in the
8 short term.

9 Number two, we're working to advance bringing
10 high-speed rail to Southern California. And that piece
11 right now that we are very focused on is the piece from the
12 Antelope Valley to the San Fernando Valley. And we've heard
13 a lot of people testify about the great things that that
14 could offer the region in the future, and also the short
15 term concerns as we work to construct this.

16 So I won't get too far into that, except to say
17 that that is not all we are doing in Southern California.
18 We are also advancing down to Anaheim, we are advancing
19 Bakersfield to Palmdale, and we are advancing these
20 connections between Los Angeles and San Diego. And again,
21 we are doing this with the partnership of our local
22 agencies, as well as our local cities.

23 Number one, we have Bakersfield to Palmdale. You
24 can see it here. We are crossing the Tehachapis, as we have
25 discussed before. You can see some of the points of

1 interest that we're traveling by. We're traveling by the
2 Cesar Chavez National Monument. We go through the City of
3 Tehachapi. We're going adjacent to Edwards Air Force Base
4 through the city of Rosamond and into the Palmdale
5 Transportation Center.

6 I want to highlight one of the things that we are
7 doing here which is working with Kern County to make sure
8 that we avoid impacts to the green energy generation at the
9 south end of the Antelope Valley. As we are an all-electric
10 train. As we will draw electricity, it is very important
11 for us to make sure that we are also supporting green energy
12 generation for the State of California. And there are
13 substantial wind farms, as well as solar farms up there, and
14 we want to make sure that we are not impacting those.

15 Number two, our Palmdale to Burbank section.
16 Again, this is really a big idea for Southern California,
17 being able to link the San Fernando Valley and the Antelope
18 Valley with fast, convenient, simple transportation
19 connectivity. We are potentially in proximity, as you know,
20 to the Angeles National Forest. And we will absolutely
21 respect this natural resource as we move through the process
22 to develop the right alignments to study both through the
23 environmental document process, as well as ultimately the
24 right alignment to select for this particular linkage, which
25 importantly now is adjacent to the Burbank Airport.

1 And -- excuse me -- Don has talked about the
2 importance of that connectivity. There's that triangle
3 right there that represents both the LOSSAN Corridor and the
4 Antelope Valley Corridor. So we've got now connectivity to
5 both the Central Coast of California, as well as the
6 Antelope Valley. And so this is really a big idea for our
7 station location in the San Fernando Valley.

8 Moving south, of course, from the Burbank Airport
9 down into Los Angeles Union Station. And I should mention
10 that these stars and -- that you see up here on the map are
11 representative of the locations of some of those partnership
12 projects that were, again, presented by Don, that the High-
13 Speed Rail is working in partnership to unfold with them.
14 So up north of the Burbank Airport, that's Brighton to
15 Roxford double track. Right by the I-5, that's the Doran
16 Street grade separation. Moving into Los Angeles Union
17 Station, that's representative of the SCRIP project, as well
18 as some of the investments we're making in the Metrolink
19 system. So this is absolutely critical that we bring high-
20 speed rail to Rome, as Don suggested, from the center of the
21 universe.

22 Moving further south, Los Angeles Union Station to
23 Anaheim, as you heard earlier, Chris Murray from the City of
24 Anaheim gave remarks about the importance of the high-speed
25 system to Anaheim. And they are going to be bringing

1 online -- they will opening their Regional Intermodal
2 Transportation Center, essentially the southern terminus of
3 the Phase 1 High-Speed Rail System. And they are bringing
4 that online. They brought it online on time and on budget,
5 and they will be opening it at the end of the year. So I
6 would highly encourage all of the Board Members to travel
7 down there and take a look at that. And this completes our
8 Phase 1 system of the high-speed rail.

9 And this is our Phase 2 system, the Los Angeles to
10 San Diego is the longest single section in the system right
11 now. You can see that it travels out through the -- out
12 through the San Gabriel Valley into the Inland Empire and
13 goes down through the Inland Empire into San Diego. It does
14 parallel the I-15 which was talked about in Andrew Mack's
15 presentation. And that is one of the most congested and
16 more important, both people and goods' movement corridors
17 for Southern California. And it does provide a passenger
18 rail connection between the Inland Empire, one of the
19 fastest growing parts of Southern California, and San Diego,
20 which does not exist.

21 The connection right now is along the coast, along
22 the LOSSAN, and that is one of the most highly ridden lines
23 in the country, as was mentioned. But there is no passenger
24 rail service for those folks going from San Diego to the
25 Inland Empire. So this would be part of solving another gap

1 within our state passenger rail system.

2 And with that I'm done.

3 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Could I just ask you --

4 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Mr. Rossi?

5 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: -- when you use the terms
6 Phase 1 and Phase 2, those are San Francisco to San Diego
7 terms, not just this section you're showing us here;
8 correct?

9 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: No. I think they're the bond
10 measure terms.

11 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Right. It's
12 referring to the -- in 1A, Phase 1 was San Francisco --

13 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: Right.

14 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: -- to Los
15 Angeles.

16 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I understand which terms they
17 are. But it's a little hard to see the map here, but just
18 looking at the Southern California doesn't --

19 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Correct.

20 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: So if they're going to talk
21 about Phase 1 and Phase 2 you need --

22 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: You also need to
23 look at Sacramento to --

24 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: -- you need to look at the
25 other half.

1 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Right.

2 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: True.

3 MS. BOEHM: Absolutely. Absolutely. We were
4 focused on Southern California.

5 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: Her life stops
6 at the Tehachapis.

7 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I just wanted to make sure
8 that we're all clear on that.

9 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER MORALES: It's like the
10 New Yorkers' view of the world.

11 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Yeah, right.

12 BOARD MEMBER ROSSI: I understand the center of
13 the universe and everything.

14 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: I have to reactions to
15 Michelle's presentations. The first one is it just reminds
16 us of the enormity of this project in terms of the things
17 that have to be done to build a system like this. And
18 people want to know why it's so expensive. And all you have
19 to do is kind of drive from one end of this map to the other
20 and see the topography and the cities and the communities
21 and so forth, you get a really strong sense of it.

22 The other thing that struck me is the enormity of
23 your job and what an outstanding job you do. I think you're
24 a consummate professional. When we had all the people here
25 this morning, many of whom had been at these meetings,

1 you -- you were in charge of all of that, you and your staff
2 and your consultants. And I just want to say that we're
3 very lucky to have you. Because I tell people all the time
4 that, you know, having seen this project from several years
5 ago, when they write the book about the high-speed rail
6 project the first several chapters will be how to do
7 everything wrong when building a mega project. And I think
8 our job now is to have them write the later chapters on how
9 you do everything right. And, Michelle, you're a really key
10 part of that.

11 And, Jeff, you brought us three great leaders in
12 our three regions. And for that you are to be commended.

13 But you have really done a marvelous job,
14 Michelle, and I just wanted to thank you.

15 MS. BOEHM: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Other questions for Ms. Boehm?

17 All right, we're about to enter into closed
18 session. I appreciate everybody's patience. I would like
19 to take one second -- one second. We -- we lost another
20 transportation leader this week, Senator John Foran was a
21 long-time head of the Senate Transportation Committee. So
22 I'd like our records to reflect that we're adjourning the
23 meeting in his name, and he accomplished quite a bit.

24 With that the Board will now enter into closed
25 session. We'll take about a five minute recess and get into

1 closed sessions, and after which we will report on any
2 outcome.

3 Thank you all very much for coming today.

4 (The High-Speed Rail Authority meeting
5 convened into Closed Session at 1:38 p.m.)

6 CHAIRMAN RICHARD: Upon returning from closed
7 session and having no further business, this meeting is now
8 adjourned.

9 (The High-Speed Rail Authority meeting
10 adjourned at 2:50 p.m.)

11 --oOo--

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
23 I, MARTHA L. NELSON, an Electronic Reporter, do
4 hereby certify that I am a disinterested person herein; that
5 I recorded the foregoing California High-Speed Rail
6 Authority Meeting; that it was thereafter transcribed.7 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
8 attorney for any of the parties to said conference, or in
9 any way interested in the outcome of said conference.10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
11 this 16th day of September, 2014.12 /s/ Martha L. Nelson
13 MARTHA L. NELSON

14

15

16 CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER
1718 I certify that the foregoing is a correct
19 transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic
20 sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled
21 matter.

22

23

24

/s/ Martha L. Nelson
MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367September 16, 2014